

The Finger of God

realization did but deepen his sense of peace and inner con-



Vladimir Andrianov

**TNCs:
STRIKE FORCE
OF
NEO-GLOBALISM**

An all-embracing system of
international security is the answer

Vladimir Andrianov

**TNCs:
STRIKE FORCE
OF
NEO-GLOBALISM**

MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY



105020CL



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED
NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS BANGALORE
HYDERABAD AHMEDABAD LUCKNOW

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

Prarthna Flats (1st Floor), Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

15 J.N. Heredia Marg, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400038

3-5-1129 Kachiguda Cross Road, Hyderabad 500027

Patiala House, 16A Ashok Marg, Lucknow 226001

5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700072

13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110002

751, Mount Road, Madras 600002

First Published, 1987

© Vladimir Andrianov, 1987

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION
3	EXPANSION SCALE, FORMS, METHODS
9	GREATER, DIVERSIFIED DEPENDENCE
16	TNCs: CATALYSTS OF CRISIS
21	FINANCIAL BONDAGE
26	INVOLVEMENT IN ARMS RACE
34	SOLE ALTERNATIVE
40	CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Neoglobalism means total disregard for generally recognised norms of international relations and violation of the sovereignty of nations. It is an outrageous but vain attempt to rob the nations of the right to a free choice.

In other words, this doctrine is nothing new in the age-old system of brigandage. It is a generalised policy of modern colonialism and militarism.

Transnational corporations (TNCs) are the basis and the strike force of this policy. Like giant octopuses they have gripped many nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America in a bid to prop up the remaining elements of the disintegrated system of oppression and enslavement. The task of the TNCs is to retain the developing countries in the capitalist camp as suppliers of raw materials, and areas for capital investment and trade market. No wonder the TNCs move heaven and earth to prevent the newly-free countries from taking the road of progressive socio-economic development.

"We know that some people still regard the world as their private domain and declare zones of their 'vital interests' wherever they like," said Mikhail Gorbachev at the Moscow forum *For Nuclear-Free World, for Survival of Humanity*. "This in turn stimulates the arms race because such views stem from a policy of strength,

without which it is impossible to attain political and economic domination. This is stereotyped thinking belonging to a time when it was considered 'right' to exploit other peoples, to manage their resources and to arbitrarily decide their destinies."

To attain their aims the neoglobalists use a whole arsenal of economic, political, ideological and even military methods, in particular the expansion of capital and economic diktat, food shortages and the technological dependence of the newly-free countries on the capitalist states.

One of the main levers of neocolonialist exploitation is the huge debt of the developing countries (roughly one trillion dollars), one quarter of which was borrowed to finance the purchases of Western arms and military hardware. The imperialist countries, and above all the US military-industrial complex, use the interest collected on this debt to finance their gigantic military programmes thus shifting onto the newly-free countries the heavy burden of the arms race.

When the TNCs and their patrons cannot achieve their neoglobalist aims through economic leverage, they turn to sabotage, instigate and fan regional conflicts, support internal reaction, intrude in the political life of newly-free countries, finance and arm terrorists, and topple unsuitable governments by using direct armed intervention. The "psychological warfare" and all kinds of ideological sabotage have become part and parcel of the policy of neoglobalism.

I. EXPANSION : SCALE, FORMS, METHODS

The developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which have won political independence now have to fight for their economic sovereignty. In a historically short period of time they must overcome their backwardness through modernising economy. Since they won independence, the developing countries have advanced much farther than they did over the entire period of colonialism

But the imperialist countries that would not stand the greater economic independence of the newly-free nations, seek to keep them dependent and continue exploiting their resources.

This aim is served by the policy of neoglobalism and its basis, the transnational corporations. In the 1980s the TNCs have been expanding their intrusion in the economy of the newly-free countries. In many of them the TNCs have become an inseparable part of the economic mechanism. The TNCs vary their activities in response to changes in the socio-economic situation in the Third World countries and quickly adapt to new conditions.

The TNCs' economic expansion is based on direct investment of productive capital and the formation of foreign subsidiaries and branch companies. By exporting productive capital the transnationals retain

remain on the outskirts of TNCs' attention which invested only 7.6 per cent of capital in these countries in the 1980s.

The same trend underlies regional distribution of direct investment. The growing TNC investment in Latin America and Southeast Asia leads to the curtailment of investment in Africa and South and West Asia.

The above shifts depend on the changes in the branch structure of foreign investment in the developing countries. More funds are invested in the dynamic processing industries and, consequently, in the countries where these industries are developed. Investment in agriculture and raw materials, once the key sphere of foreign investment, has been on the decrease.

The activities of TNCs promote, in a way, economic progress of the developing countries by modernising some branches, establishing certain import-substituting industries, increasing employment and exports. Yet the forms and methods of TNCs' activities often run counter to the tasks of economic development of the Third World countries and have long-term negative consequences.

In the past few years the developing countries have been suffering from lack of modern technologies which could propel their economic progress. They had to turn to the TNCs for assistance. The TNCs agreed to supply modern technology not out of altruism but because they pursue their bid for maximally increasing production operations in the Third World and deriving superprofits.

The developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America sometimes receive from the TNCs technologies which turn out to be outdated or inadequate for local conditions and possibilities. The technology transfer agreements often include clauses

which limit its use. Besides, the new technologies are first supplied to the TNC branches and only then passed on to other industrial sectors.

The industrialised countries often transfer ecologically-hazardous industries to the Third World and reduce the cost of production by saving on purification facilities. All this leads to environmental pollution in many Third World countries.

Thus, in Malaysia one-third of all polluted water bodies were contaminated by palm oil-producing plants, the largest of them controlled by the Japanese TNCs Marubeni, Mitsubishi and Nippon Oil and Fats. The US Union Carbide branch in India is known to have caused a chemical disaster there in the city of Bhopal. Pollution is rampant in such industrially developed regions of the Third World as Rio de Janeiro, Mexico City, Bombay, Tehran, Seoul and Jakarta. The TNCs have caused the Third World ecological damage to the tune of tens of billions of dollars.

In general, the technology supplies to the Third World do not meet the demand and are a heavy financial burden on the national economies. According to some estimates, the newly-free countries paid some 15,000 million US dollars for patents, licenses, technologies and trade marks in the mid-1980s.

This sharply reduces the worth of technology supplies and affects the development of national technological potentials. In a word, technology transfer is used by the TNCs to exploit the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The TNCs set up many of their subsidiaries and branch companies in the "free trade zones." There are some 90 such zones in the Third World, with nearly half of them in Asia. The TNC subsidiaries in these zones specialize mainly in the assembly and production of electronic components, toys, clothes and sportswear.

The high competitiveness of these goods is accounted for by cheap local labour who, unlike the workers in capitalist countries, draw no social benefits.

Seventy per cent of workforce employed in the free trade zones are women who are most ruthlessly exploited, particularly in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia. The proprietors believe that women workers cause less complications, and cost less than men or machines. These zones are sometimes termed as "labour camps" because the employers prohibit trade unions, strikes or political demands there.

Besides, by setting up their enterprises in the free trade zones the TNCs save on the infrastructure (roads, buildings and power supply paid for by the local governments). The TNCs draw additional profits from tax-free import of raw materials and export of manufactured goods, relief from taxes and the like. So the TNCs' manufacturing enterprises in the Third World bring huge profits.

The activities of the TNCs in the mining industry and agriculture of developing countries deplete their mineral resources. It happened in the case of iron and tin ores in Malaysia plundered by the British companies Eastern Mining, London Tin Corporation and Charter Consolidated. The Japanese TNCs have caused irreparable damage to the forests of Indonesia, Malaysia and other Southeast Asian countries.

The TNC giants, these financial behemoths with a broad sphere of international activities, have at their disposal various methods of influencing the foreign trade of the young states. The limited commercial practice, agreements on preferential rights on sales, prices and the use of patents and licenses, and intra-company operations and transfer prices not only complicate the foreign trade activities of the Third

World countries but result in great financial losses for the developing countries involved in international trade.

A large part of the trade of the developing countries with imperialist states is effected through intra-company TNC channels using transfer prices. UN analyses show that the TNCs have special reasons for using transfer prices in trade with the developing rather than the industrialised countries. Fearing nationalisation, the TNCs seek to speed up investment turnover and avoid taxes on profits. Another reason is that transfer prices allow the TNCs to evade limitations on the export of profits.

The TNC manipulations with transfer prices promoted their monopoly status at individual markets. It transpired in the early 1980s that goods supplied by the TNCs to Colombia were over-priced on the average by 155 per cent in pharmaceuticals, 54 per cent in electronics, 44 per cent in technical rubber engineering and 25 per cent in the chemical industry. Some foreign goods were over-priced by 3,000 per cent. The same applies to Peru where imported medicines cost 300 per cent more than in the producer country, Iran which was sold raw materials at a price 100 times higher than the retail prices, and India where TNC dye-producing branches raised prices for imported dyes by 140-350 per cent.

The transfer prices machinations affect most developing countries which since the mid-1960s have lost 200-229 billion US dollars as a result of price scissors.

II. GREATER, DIVERSIFIED DEPENDENCE

The development of certain Third World industries encouraged in part by foreign investment has failed to enhance the developing countries' economic independence. In the meantime, increasing penetration by transnational corporations into developing economies only consolidates the links between emergent nations and major industrial centres of imperialism. Thus economic expansion by transnationals is becoming a crucial part in a succession of moves to promote "strings-attached" capitalism in emergent countries. This dependence in the past few years has been added to and diversified in many respects.

In some countries, the encouraging of foreign investment has facilitated its role in the reproduction of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In the "newly industrializing countries" about half of the GDP is generated by the foreign-controlled sector of which the bulk belongs to enterprises controlled by transnational corporations.

This means that Third World industrialization is virtually in the hands of transnationals. Many branches of developing economies, particularly the manufacturing industry (electrotechnical, auto assembly plants, etc.), offer a vivid example of "parcelated" production, whereby the initial and final stages of technological

processes are headquartered in the Western industrialized countries and the intermediate stages in the developing nations. It is a new kind of technological bondage in which emergent countries are ever more deeply integrated in the world capitalist economy as subordinated and unequal members.

Many Third World economies are still heavily export-oriented, something that makes them ever more dependent on the chief centres of imperialism. In spite of recent attempts to diversify exports, many a developing nation is still a one-item exporter. For example, by the mid-1980s 54 per cent of Gambia's exports fell on peanuts, 52 per cent of Colombia's exports on coffee, 47 per cent of Burma's exports on rice, 43 per cent of Chile's exports on copper, 44 per cent of Ghana's exports on cocoa beans, 27 per cent of Costa Rica's exports on coffee and 24 per cent on bananas, and 24 per cent of Morocco's exports on phosphates.

This lopsided specialisation makes a country's economy entirely dependent on exports and world market conditions. This dependence is particularly hurting during all kinds of upheavals in the foreign markets as well as during economic crises in Western countries.

Earlier the Third World was dependent on the West in raw materials sales. With the advent of manufacturing industries difficulties cropped up also for its manufactured goods traders. As a rule, semi-finished products turned out by transnationals are more or less easily sold, because they are sought by parent companies. However, attempts to sell finished goods ran into all kinds of protectionist barriers devised by the home countries of transnationals.

At the present time import restraints cover a variety of manufactured goods, with the draconian

measures being applied against highly competitive goods from the Third World, such as textiles, clothes, footwear, electronic components, calculators, radio sets, leather goods, carpets and garments, rolled stock, electrical equipment and some processed foods, including coffee, palm oil, cocoa-based products etc.

The problem is aggravated by the fact that Asian, African and Latin American countries are heavily dependent on the West in marketing and advertising since most of the commercial networks in the capitalist states are monopolized by transnationals. Transnational corporations currently control about half of Third World export-import transactions. In raw materials trade, their share in the early 1980s amounted to 70-80 per cent.

Under the impact of transnationals, Third World trade has been split into two distinct channels—the usual commercial deals and transfer sales. The latter differ from normal commercial transactions in that they do not depend on independent dealers and middlemen and are largely isolated from the influences of the world market and international competition. Commodity traffic through transfer channels is regulated by intracompany planning at transnationals' headquarters, rather than encouraged by traditional means.

Transfer sales in overall corporate trade are vast in scope and scale, ranging between 25 and 95 per cent for many raw materials exports. In the early 1980s the share of 15 major transnationals amounted to 90-95 per cent in iron ore exports; 90 per cent in sawn timber exports; 85 to 90 per cent in cotton, tobacco, coffee, jute, wheat and corn exports; 85 per cent in cocoa beans exports; 80 to 85 per cent in copper and bauxite exports; 80 per cent in tea exports; 75 to 80 per cent in tin exports; 75 per cent in oil exports; 70 to 75 per cent in bananas and natural rubber exports; 70 per cent in

rice exports; 60 per cent in sugar exports; and 25 per cent in raw hides exports.¹

Most of intracompany transactions are effected in transfer prices. Transnationals set prices for goods they buy and sell in Asian, African and Latin American countries, relying on their control of the world markets, patent monopoly, trade marks and other privileges. Transfer sales cover the most arbitrary and secret operations accomplished by transnational corporations that often violate local laws of emergent nations.

As a result, developing countries find themselves heavily dependent on rapacious price policies of the TNCs. According to some estimates, what they get for their exported raw materials amounts to about a quarter of the product selling price.

Furthermore, while producing the bulk of raw materials, emergent nations often cannot deliver them to consumers. In the mid-1980s they controlled only about 14 per cent of the world mercantile marine's tonnage. That explains why freight costs amount to only 5.3 per cent of the product price for the capitalist countries and almost twice as much, that is 10.7 per cent, for developing nations.² Having scored some achievements in the production of exports, emergent nations by far remain almost entirely dependent on transnational shipping companies of the imperialist powers in the handling and ensuring of their export traffic.

In the era of the scientific and technological revolution economic progress in developing countries largely depends on the extent to which they use advanced technologies and scientific discoveries and inventions. One of the chief goals pursued by transnationals in technological policy is to safeguard

1. *The CTC Reporter*, No. 15, Spring, 1983.

2. Document UNCTAD TD/B/C.4/266

their monopoly on know-how. As a result, developing countries know no other way to acquire technology and know-how, of which 80 to 90 per cent is controlled by the self-same transnationals, except importing it. For instance, should one of the developing countries want to produce aluminium, most of them would then have to agree to terms imposed on them by such transnationals as ALCAN, ALCOA, Kaiser, Reynolds or Pechiney that have a virtual monopoly over aluminium production.

Over 90 per cent of scientific researchers of the capitalist world live in industrialised countries. Of about 3.5 million patents registered throughout the world in the early 1980s only six per cent belonged to the developing countries, an indication that the fruits of the technological revolution are reaped by the imperialist powers and their transnationals commanding advanced technology.

Transnational corporations want to prevent real transfer of technology to the developing nations under all kinds of pretexts. Even in cases of a transfer of technology for the production of certain items there has not been actual sharing of know-how in most cases.

Analysing the mechanism of technology transfer to Brazilian companies, the magazine *Indústria e produtividade*, an official organ of the National Conference of Brazil, wrote: "Attention should be drawn to the fact that the process of buying and selling technology is not technology transfer. The use of the word 'transfer' instead of 'purchase' creates an illusion that the transferring side makes an altruistic act offering the buyer all the know-how it commands in the field in order to help emergent nations solve some of the problems facing them. But what usually happens in real life is the act of selling in which the seller more often

than not hides the real know-how, selling operation manuals instead."¹

One of the ways for transnationals to sell technology without transfer of know-how is to trade in what they call sealed technology packages, in which case no particulars about technological processes are given to client countries that receive only operational units and operating manuals. As the arrangement does not imply a real transfer of technology, emergent nations find themselves always dependent on technical assistance of the transnationals.

Access to advanced know-how could significantly quicken the pace of development in emergent countries, narrow the gap between the developed and developing worlds and facilitate the dismantling of the system in which one group of countries exploits another group. However, transnationals turned their monopoly on scientific and technological achievements into a powerful leverage for imperialist subordination and exploitation of emergent nations.

Asian, African and Latin American nations in the 1960s, after attaining political independence, depended on Western goods and technology. Today, still depending on the same goods and technology, they owe the West a staggering debt of about one trillion dollars which has grown to a point where it begins to reproduce itself on a vast scale.

Some debt-trapped nations need new financial injections as badly as a drug addict needs a shot, the fact that makes this kind of dependence increasingly dangerous, damaging and fraught with dire consequences.

It would be erroneous to say that the ruling imperialist quarters are unaware of the danger inherent

1. *Industria e produtividade*, N 174, outubro de 1983.

in the situation. However, their concerns boil down to just one end—how to safeguard the existing system of waxing rich on exploitation and super exploitation of the *developing nations*, how to push them still deeper into the quagmire of debts.

The Third World's contribution to some economic branches is regarded by transnationals as a ticket to further exploitation and the maximization of profits. That is why the development of new industries and promotion of corporate investment in developing countries cannot be qualified as industrialization. It is a lopsided process because the development of productive forces in its first phase becomes entirely dependent on the imperialist powers which are the home countries of transnationals. The bondage changes in form, rather than lessens, growing ever more sophisticated structurally and technologically.

III. TNCs: CATALYSTS OF CRISIS

The world capitalist economy is crisis-ridden, with all capitalist countries, particularly the leading, plagued by a recurrent economic crisis, compounded by energy, currency, raw-materials and food crises.

These are rooted in the post-war economic trends, such as concentration of financial resources and industry in the developed countries, the fast expansion of the TNCs, the growing role of the state-monopoly capitalism, and the monopolisation of the results of the scientific and technological revolution in Western countries.

The post-war period has seen new features of the crisis in the capitalist economy. Economic growth has declined, the periods of revival have become shorter, less pronounced and less stable. Inflation and unemployment have been growing fast, financial instability has become chronic, and cyclic crises have intertwined with structural ones, spilling over into the emerging nations. Lenin wrote that the process of reproduction under imperialism had become international following internationalisation of production. Contradictions of capitalism had transcended national boundaries, engulfing the whole of the world capitalist economy.

Crisis developments spread to backward countries

which have not yet reached the stage of capitalism because they are dependent on world imperialism and because the framework of the capitalist relations of production expands. Practice has shown that the higher the degree of capitalist development in any particular developing country or region and the stronger the positions of foreign capital and TNCs there—the greater the impact of the recurrent crises on the developing countries.

Attempts by the imperialist nations to deal with their economic troubles at the expense of the developing countries have become particularly obvious in recent years, with the TNCs being the crisis-exporting vehicles acting as catalysts of crisis developments within Asian, African and Latin American nations. Witness the crisis which hit capitalist countries in 1980-1982.

Never before had a crisis in the developed countries so quickly triggered an economic slump in the Third World, particularly in the Middle East, affecting virtually the entire world capitalist economy. Indicatively, the developing countries suffered more than the developed nations. The decline in growth and the rise in inflation and unemployment were much more pronounced there than in the US, Western Europe and Japan.

The growth of the GDP in the developing countries in 1980-81 decreased 0.2 per cent, and in 1981-82 it grew at a rate of 0.5 per cent, far below the average of 7 per cent sought by the UN Development Programme for 1981-90. The per capita income dropped, mostly in the least developed countries.

The unfavourable situation on the world commodity markets, the low demand for the traditional Third World exports caused prices to plummet. In 1981-82 the export price index in the developing countries on the whole was down 7 per cent, though prices for Latin American commodities decreased 12 per cent, African

by 8 per cent, and Asian 4 per cent. High prices of manufactured goods, the main import items of the newly-free nations, worsened the terms of trade, inequitable as it is for most Third World countries. The terms of their trade worsened by 7 per cent.

The economic plight of the newly-free countries is deteriorating as the advanced capitalist nations intensify protectionism, putting up more and more non-tariff barriers in addition to tariff restrictions. In recent years, on top of import quotas, compensatory and anti-dumping duties, there appeared "voluntary" export restrictions, agreements on "streamlining trade", sanitary standards, documents certifying the origin of goods, new marking and packaging requirements, etc. Experts estimate that protectionist restrictions have covered some 65 per cent of the imports of manufactured goods from the developing countries.

The overall volume of Third World exports has decreased by 6 per cent (by 9 per cent in Asia, and by 2 per cent in Africa), with the export earnings of the developing countries in the crisis period down by 80,600 million US dollars.¹ Since for most of these countries exports remain the basic source of hard currency and are vital for economic development, their reduction has had an impact on all aspects of economic life in the developing countries.

The current international debt crisis is unprecedented in terms of magnitude and implications. In 1982 the foreign debt arrears of 35 nations reached some 140 billion dollars.

Faced with the increased likelihood of default, many Western creditors, particularly private transnational

(1) Based on data from *Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics*, Supplement 1985, *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, April 1985.

banks, have started to withdraw the earlier granted loans, thus making it impossible for the borrowers to meet their current obligations. As a result, the net flight of capital from the developing countries has totalled some 11 billion dollars.

As the debt crisis persists, the transnational banks and financial institutions of the imperialist nations, fearful of the possible disruption of their credit system, provide "emergency financial aid" to the developing countries and reschedule their debts, using this aid as leverage against the Third World and as a means of furthering their neo-globalist objectives.

Inflationary processes have intensified, with the annual price increase in 1982 at 34.3 per cent, much more than the corresponding figure for the industrially developed nations. TNCs are manipulating prices, making inflation even worse. As a result, inflationary processes are shifting to Asian, African and Latin American countries, with their impact greater every year. There is a direct relation between the positions of the TNCs abroad and the rate of inflation. Prices grow faster in those countries where the TNCs are firmly established. For instance, in 1985 inflation was running at 463.3 per cent in Argentina, at 217.9 per cent in Brazil, at 169.9 per cent in Peru, and at 59.8 per cent in Mexico.¹

Convertible currencies used in settling international accounts serve as yet another means of exporting inflation to the developing countries and intensifying their exploitation.

The fall in the leading economic indicators has been attended by worsening social problems in many developing countries. The number of unemployed and

(1) Cepal, *Comision Economica Para America Latina EL CARIBE*, Diciembre de 1985

under-employed in the developing countries has grown to 500 million, or 40 per cent of the able-bodied population. These figures show that the problem of unemployment is far more acute in the Third World than it is in the developed countries. Apart from that, real wages have fallen and the distribution of wealth has become even more uneven—to the detriment of large sections of the population.

Significantly, even during more or less dynamic economic growth in the developing countries wealth is distributed unevenly and employment fails to reach the desired level, while in times of crisis and a general worsening of the situation the low-income sections suffer the most.

In 1986 most developing countries were once again in crisis. The deteriorating situation on the world capitalist market affected the Third World nations more than other countries primarily because there was a sharp fall in the prices of raw materials and fuel, particularly oil, which accounts for a large portion of their exports. As a result, Third World exports shrank both in volume and cost. That is not accidental. Using the achievements of technological progress and reducing the requirements for raw materials and energy products, the imperialist nations are seeking to shift the burden of the crisis on to the economically weaker developing countries, thus intensifying their exploitation. On Western estimates, the developing countries have made the advanced capitalist nations a "gift" of several dozen billion dollars.

So, the social and economic crisis, compounded as it is by recurrent recession, is a global problem which is impossible to resolve without overhauling economic relations between the developed and developing countries, putting TNC activities under control, and changing the entire world economic order.

IV. FINANCIAL BONDAGE

Neoglobalism increasingly promotes the export of loan capital to the developing countries. Between 1980 and 1983 the loans and grants of Western countries or the West-controlled international financial institutions to the Third World totalled 238 billion dollars, greatly exceeding direct investments. Loans are becoming the main form of the export of capital to the developing countries, highlighting its usurious character.

The pattern of the export of loan capital to Asia, Africa and Latin America is changing. The specific share of private finance, coming from major transnational banks, has increased. In the 1980s, it has reached 64.3 per cent of overall external finance at the expense of official development aid which has gone down to 35.6 per cent. The proportion of easy-term finance reaching the Third World has reduced markedly to 38 per cent in favour of the loans extended on commercial or near-commercial conditions.¹

This shows that the imperialists are toughening financial policies with regard to the developing nations. For instance, the United States considers that American aid should be handled by private enterprise and not

1. *Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics*, Supplement 1985

by the government. US aid should be bilateral and geared to Washington's political and military interests, they say. Such views confirm the West's neocolonialist attitudes to the Third World's external finances.

A considerable proportion of US aid goes for military purposes. In 1985 US military aid climbed to 11.3 billion dollars, 38 per cent of overall American foreign aid. This leads to the militarization of emergent countries' economic activity.¹

Loans further increase the tremendous debt of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The debt question has economic and political aspects. What is at issue is not only the current financial commitments of many Third World countries, but also their economic future, particularly the unreliable foundation of their loan-geared growth and its sinister implications.

Between 1980 and 1986 external debt of the developing countries grew from 570 billion to 967 billion dollars and its share of these nations' GDP rose from 25.9 to 40.4 per cent. In 1987 the Third World's debt is likely to exceed a trillion dollars. Latin America is responsible for 54 per cent of the Third World's debt, Asia for 27 per cent and Africa for 19 per cent.²

Three countries, Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, where the multinationals' positions are particularly strong, account for nearly a third of the Third World's debt. The major debtors in South and Southeast Asia are Indonesia, 28.5 billion dollars (1985); India, 26.3 billion dollars; the Philippines, 24.8 billion dollars (1984); Malaysia, 12.8 billion dollars; and Bangladesh, 5.2 billion dollars (1984).

Transnational banks are active in enslaving emergent

1. *US Overseas Loans and Grants*, Washington, 1985.

2. *World Economic Outlook*, a Survey by the Staff of the International Monetary Fund, October 1986.

countries financially. For instance, 1,400 private commercial banks extend loans to Brazil, and some 1,000 such banks are involved in such operations with Mexico. Nearly 70 per cent of the Third World's debt is traceable to 82 transnational banks, including 24 Japanese, 15 American, 11 West German, 8 French, 8 Italian, 5 British and 5 Canadian.

In the mid-80s over half of the transnational banks' overseas offices have been in the Third World, with the United States dominating in Latin America, Japan in Southeast Asia and Western Europe in Africa.

Foreign debt grows through debt-servicing payments which currently exceed new loans and grants.

Debt return payments absorb developing nations' foreign exchange receipts from exports. Foreign exchange goes to return the debt rather than purchase commodities these nations need.

The export-debt return ratio shows how far this process has gone. In 1983 the corresponding indice was as follows: Argentina, 149 per cent; Brazil, 82 per cent; Peru, 66 per cent; Chile, 63 per cent, Mexico, 59 per cent; and Columbia, 43 per cent. For the developing countries as a group in 1986 the figure averaged 24.2 per cent, which fact shows that newly-free states do not use nearly a quarter of export receipts for development.¹

This undercuts the import potentialities of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many developing nations curtail imports to the detriment of social and economic programmes.

External debt also makes for imbalances in national finances. These imbalances reveal themselves in

1 *World Debt Tables*. 1984-1985 Edition, World Bank, Washington, 1985.

budget deficit, with debt-based expenditures vastly exceeding revenues in big debtor-nations.

Debt servicing has an adverse impact on developing states' balances of payments, showing deficit for some years now. In 1983 the aggregate deficit of the Third World's balance of payments reached 20.4 billion dollars, with Latin America accounting for 58.8 per cent of the total, Africa for 25.1 per cent and Asia for 16.1 per cent. In Asia, the bigger deficits are shown by India, the Philippines and Thailand.¹

The withdrawal of profits by multinational corporations also has a bad effect on the balance of payments. In 1983 the outflow of funds from the developing countries reached 21.3 billion dollars, nearly doubling new direct investments. Profits are expatriated with the aid of transnational banks which thus deprive developing nations of a considerable part of their GNP.

The worsening solvency status of most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America results in the bulk of new external finance being used to return debts and finance balance-of-payment deficit, not for development. Nowadays this claims up to 50 per cent of the Third World's external finance coming from the West.

Difficulties of the developing countries due to repaying their huge debt adversely affect national currency systems, particularly domestic pricing. In 1986 consumer prices grew by an average of 25.9 per cent in the Third World. Developing countries have a much higher level of inflation than the West.

The imperialists use financial bondage to enforce upon newly-free states' development patterns favouring multinational corporations. They insist on import and

1. *Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics*, UN, 1985.

private foreign investment liberalization, public sector dismantling, devaluation, social and economic growth curtailment, and involvement of their experts in drafting the budgets of developing states.

There is a direct link between the debtor status of the developing nations and their involvement in militaristic preparations. Neoglobalism uses as its bases South Korea, whose debt has reached 47 billion dollars in the mid-80s; the Philippines, 25 billion dollars; Pakistan, 15 billion dollars; Chile, 15 billion dollars; Thailand, nearly 10 billion dollars; Sudan, 6 billion dollars; Zaire, 4 billion dollars; and Somalia, over a billion dollars.¹

The developing countries' indebtedness allows the imperialists to have military bases there. The imperialist military presence in the Third World is used for acts of aggression and also to protect the interests of the Western investors and perpetuate the developing nations' financial slavery.

1. *World Debt Tables*, External Debt of Developing Countries, 1984-1985

V. INVOLVEMENT IN ARMS RACE

The arms race, now assuming unprecedented proportions, has been one of the most dangerous developments ever since World War II. It has been a sequel to, and manifestation of the policy of neoglobalism of the imperialist powers which are banking on the direct or indirect use of armed force to retain their economic, political and military positions undercut by the irresistible process of the revolutionary remaking of the world.

It is the transnational corporations of the military-industrial complexes (MIC) of the U.S. and other Western countries, waxing fat on war orders, that have the greatest stake in spiraling military expenditures and in the new and dangerous round of the arms race.

It was President Eisenhower who, speaking at the end of his term of office on January 17, 1961, first noted the rising influence of the MIC in the economic, political and even intellectual life of the United States. His warning remained unheeded, however, and today we bear witness to the formidable danger that the MIC is posing not only to the US but also to the rest of humanity.

Transnationals make up the core of the military-industrial complex. Arms manufacturers are those that used to be called cannon and dynamite kings

at the turn of the century and who now preside over aeromissile, nuclear and electronic empires. This is the elite of the military business, a relatively small group of corporations, comprising about 20-25 companies in the U.S. and between 10 and 15 companies apiece in Great Britain, West Germany and France, most of which are the capitalist world's biggest monopolies.

The world community knows most of these TNCs, above all, by their dirty tricks or loud scandals. In the last decade, 115 out of 500 big American corporations *alone have each been found guilty of at least one major offence.*

ITT is known to have been involved in overthrowing the legitimate government of Salvador Allende in Chile and Lockheed in generously bribing Japanese government officials under Prime Minister Tanaka. The Northrop Co. was engaged in similar shady dealings in the countries of Southeast Asia. The criminal negligence of the Union Carbide plant managers in the Indian city of Bhopal led to a gas leak affecting close on 50,000 people of whom over 2,000 died and 20,000 have since been in danger of becoming blind and contracting lung, kidney or other diseases. These are just a few typical features of MIC transnationals.

MIC power is a cross-breed of monopoly rule and the power of the imperialist state. Many government officials in the U.S. and NATO countries are closely connected with weapons-makers. The present US Administration is a clear case in point.

Americans say that America is in California, the home base of 8500 TNC enterprises, the Pentagon's main contractors getting nearly 90% of all war orders. That state produces 80% of aerospace technology and has created 40% of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, and there is the famous Silicon Valley there with its upwards of 600 electronics and electrical engineering monopolies. It is

there, too, that the basic programmes of the notorious SDI are being worked out. California is, indeed, a Star Wars factory.

Many high-ranking officials of the present White House Administration are closely connected with the military Big Business. It is an open secret that Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of State George Shultz, Vice-President George Bush, former CIA Director William Casey, Senators John Tower, Lloyd Bentsen, Alan Cranston, Carl Levin and many others are directly or indirectly connected with the military business. As *The U.S. News & World Report* has figured out, most of the US Defence Secretaries since 1947 have been the proxies of the MIC corporations.

The military-industrial complex is a *you-scratch-my-back-and-I-scratch-yours* bunch of manufacturers, officials, and military. Generals become presidents of munitions corporations while company presidents become ministers or vice-ministers. Congressmen support the demands of munitions corporations and their owners back up Congressmen. A vicious circle, indeed.

Annual U.S. military appropriations came up to just about \$300 billion in 1986 (the projected outlay for 1987 is \$312 billion), and those of the NATO countries were \$367.4 billion in 1985, including \$23.8 billion in Britain, \$20.7 billion in France, \$20.3 billion in West Germany, \$9.5 billion in Italy, and \$26.4 billion in the other European NATO countries, and those of Japan, \$12.9 billion. The aggregate military spending of the non-socialist world in the entire post-war period (1948-1985) was \$11,800 billion. The arms race around the world cost \$1.7 million a minute in 1986.

The arms race is entering a yet more dangerous phase, with new types of military activity under way, and spreading to the seas and outer space as well as to

there, too, that the basic programmes of the notorious SDI are being worked out. California is, indeed, a Star Wars factory.

Many high-ranking officials of the present White House Administration are closely connected with the military Big Business. It is an open secret that Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of State George Shultz, Vice-President George Bush, former CIA Director William Casey, Senators John Tower, Lloyd Bentsen, Alan Cranston, Carl Levin and many others are directly or indirectly connected with the military business. As *The U.S. News & World Report* has figured out, most of the US Defence Secretaries since 1947 have been the proxies of the MIC corporations.

The military-industrial complex is a *you-scratch-my-back-and-I-scratch-yours* bunch of manufacturers, officials, and military. Generals become presidents of munitions corporations while company presidents become ministers or vice-ministers. Congressmen support the demands of munitions corporations and their owners back up Congressmen. A vicious circle, indeed.

Annual U.S. military appropriations came up to just about \$300 billion in 1986 (the projected outlay for 1987 is \$312 billion), and those of the NATO countries were \$367.4 billion in 1985, including \$23.8 billion in Britain, \$20.7 billion in France, \$20.3 billion in West Germany, \$9.5 billion in Italy, and \$26.4 billion in the other European NATO countries, and those of Japan, \$12.9 billion. The aggregate military spending of the non-socialist world in the entire post-war period (1948-1985) was \$11,800 billion. The arms race around the world cost \$1.7 million a minute in 1986.

The arms race is entering a yet more dangerous phase, with new types of military activity under way, and spreading to the seas and outer space as well as to

regions and countries now free from colonial domination. Many developing countries are fast expanding their defence budgets and arms imports and starting both licensed and national munitions production. The operation of transnationals in a number of developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America has spawned "military-industrial mini-complexes" and encouraged the elements having a stake in growing military programmes. The involvement of the emergent nations in the arms race is an important objective of the doctrine of neoglobalism.

The military expenditure of the developing nations has been swelling even faster than that of the advanced capitalist states. The annual military appropriations of the developing countries rose from \$13 billion in 1960 to \$93.5 billion in 1982. In 1970-1982, the military expenditure of the developing nations amounted to about \$800 billion, which was roughly equivalent to the aggregate gross national product of all the countries of Africa, South Asia, South-West Asia and the Middle East, with one-third of the world's population, in 1980.¹

On the whole, the emergent nations have come to spend the same proportion of their budget money for military purposes as the advanced capitalist countries, and have even outstripped many of them in this respect over the last few years. In the early '80s, the arms bill share of the national budgets of the developing nations averaged 17%, with 23.5% in the countries of South-West Asia and the Middle East, 19.7% in the Far East, 15.7% in South Asia, 13.8% in Africa, and 9% in Latin America. The largest proportion was in Asian countries—40% in Oman, 32% in Taiwan, and 27-28% in South Korea, Saudi Arabia and Iran.

1. Estimated from *World Armaments and Disarmament*, SIPRI, Yearbook, 1983, L-N.Y., 1983, pp. 161-166.

A considerable proportion of the resources set aside by the developing nations for military purposes is used to buy arms from imperialist powers. International arms traffic has become a most adverse development at the present stage with much of this trade monopolized by transnational corporations. The concept of neoglobalism treats arms supplies as a major instrument of commercial and economic penetration into the developing nations and of drawing them into the orbit of military preparations.

The demand for arms is artificially cultivated by TNCs and imperialist states. The annual arms imports increased from \$2.4 billion in 1970 to \$8.4 billion in 1983, in the 1975 prices or more than \$16 billion in current prices. In the early '80s, the developing nations brought in over 62% of the total world imports of basic conventional arms.

The growing arms imports have led to the militarily advanced countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America being equipped with the most up-to-date systems and types of weapons: jet aircraft, up-to-date tanks, missiles of various types, electronic equipment—all TNC products. About a dozen developing countries are on the nuclear threshold.

In addition to exporting arms to the developing countries, the TNCs seek to transfer some of their military production over there. There were various munitions capacities in 30 developing countries in the mid-'80s.

The range of munitions produced is rather wide, comprising as it does fire-arms and tanks, armoured vehicles, aircraft, submarines and missiles. The biggest American TNCs—General Electric, Hewlett-Packard, Motorola, Texas Instruments—have created over 120 subsidiaries in developing countries for the manufacture of electronics and electrical engineering products for the

US munitions industry. In the early '80s, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America accounted for around 40% of the American imports of electronic components for military purposes.

The expansion of munitions industries in the developing countries is bringing the transnationals billions of dollars of profit through licenses for arms manufacture, construction of military installations and exploitation of local manpower. In this context, the TNCs of the imperialist powers seek not just to expand the markets for all kinds of military and industrial products and technology but to reproduce the basic elements of the Western military-industrial complex in the developing countries. So what happens is something like "internationalization" or "globalization" of the military business.

The expansion of military expenditure and the involvement of developing countries in the arms race bear hard upon their economies, exercise a negative influence on economic growth rates, the size and structure of investment, the pattern of foreign trade, and the balance of payments, augment their foreign debt and draw off manpower resources. There are about 15 million servicemen in the developing countries.

The more material and intellectual resources go for military purposes the less remains for vital social programmes. One must not forget that over a billion people in the developing world still live in absolute poverty. One in every four is underfed. Millions of people go hungry and 300 million children are out of school.

The militarization of the economy of the developing countries with the involvement of transnational corporations has been slowing down progress in overcoming the backwardness of emergent nations, widening the gap between the capitalist centres and

their outlying provinces, and perpetuating the unequal status of the developing countries in the world capitalist economy.

Neoglobalism further aggravates international tension, building up military expenditure and speeding up the arms race in Asia, Africa and Latin America and preventing the establishment of a new international economic order.

Neoglobalism is compounding the instability and distorting international economic relations, thereby certainly holding up the progress of humanity and reducing the opportunities for effective assistance to the developing nations which have some two-thirds of the world's population. More and more people in the world are coming to realize that the continued arms race at global and regional level and a swift resolution of the pressing issues confronting the emergent nations are totally incompatible.

The neoglobalist policy of imperialist powers has *taken on a dangerous aspect for the whole world since* the present U.S. administration came into office. A major goal of this policy has been to enable American TNCs to regain the positions they have lost around the world during the last few decades and capture new ones.

The doctrine of neoglobalism proclaims the right of imperialist powers to resort to intimidation, blackmail or pressure in dealing with the emergent nations, back up all kinds of subversive and terrorist groups and use armed forces to overthrow progressive regimes. While riding roughshod over the generally accepted standards of international law, the U.S. is unilaterally declaring just about all parts of the world to be the areas of its "vital interest." It has been making its intention to impose the American way of life and scheme of things all over the world an official government guideline.

The normal functioning of the military-industrial

complex is impossible without massive militarist indoctrination. TNCs and military departments have their own information services and channels. The Pentagon alone is financing more than a thousand newspapers and about 400 magazines and various bulletins with a total circulation of over 12 million. The Department of the Navy maintains contact with 600 television centres and 5,000 radio stations. In the last 20 years, the appropriations for the Defence Department's ideological warfare effort to sustain the policy of neoglobalism have increased 15-fold

The machinery of ideological expansionism, including its militarist aspect, has the latest in high technology at its disposal, like cable television and direct relay satellites. The screen, TV, and printed "products of violence" are now an important item in American TNC exports.

The tactics of neoglobalist propaganda are to sow the seeds of mistrust and fan up hatred for the lifestyle and ideals of Socialist society. It is to this end that the achievements of actual Socialism are glossed over and the domestic and foreign policies of the USSR are misrepresented.

But the main preoccupation in stoking up militaristic and chauvinistic ambitions is to create favourable conditions for TNC lobbies in the legislative assemblies to get more cash for military ends. In defiance of common sense, they go as far as to scuttle the existing system of arms control agreements.

VI. SOLE ALTERNATIVE

Security and progress all over the world and specifically in developing countries can be ensured only through relaxation of tension, limitation and reduction of military activity and establishment of a new international economic order. This is the sole alternative.

Life places the questions of international detente, curbing the arms race, reducing of the military expenditures and using the sums thus released for development, high on the list of the priorities facing the emergent states.

Earliest termination of the arms race and switching over to disarmament became a particularly pressing issue in the mid-1980s. In the context of the further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and deepening of its internal social problems (an economic crisis, inflation, growing unemployment, class struggle, and the intensification of the TNCs' inter imperialist rivalry for the markets and sources of raw materials and energy), the opponents of the policy of disarmament and detente have perceptibly intensified their activities. Putting the concept of neoglobalism into practice leads to deterioration of the international situation.

The world is going through a crucial stage of its history, a stage which requires a radical change of our way of thinking, resolute renunciation of the obsolete

stereotypes, categories and forms of political mentality, and a sharp turn from confrontation to international detente.

To counterbalance the concept of neoglobalism, the Soviet Union has advanced the concept of an all-embracing system of international security the essence of which lies in a comprehensive approach to resolving the outstanding issues in all spheres—military, political, economic and humanitarian.

Mankind has already witnessed first examples of a new political thinking. On January 15, 1986 the Soviet leader proposed a programme for stage-by-stage and eventually complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century. At the 27th Congress of the CPSU held in February 1986 this programme organically merged with the Soviet concept of an all-embracing system of international security.

In June 1986, the countries of the socialist community advanced a detailed plan for radically reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe on the territory from the Atlantic to the Urals. New proposals were tabled at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, at the Geneva Soviet-US talks on nuclear and space weapons, and at the Vienna talks.

A broad platform for ensuring security and cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region was advanced. It was suggested that a safety regime for development of the nuclear power industry be created and that a world space organisation be set up. A programme for building "Star Peace" was submitted to the United Nations as an alternative to the "Star Wars" programme.

For more than sixteen months the Soviet Union did not conduct any nuclear tests, calling upon the USA to follow its example. The USSR also adopted a new approach to the verification issue. Fresh evidence of the USSR's peaceable line were the far-reaching Soviet

proposals on disarmament at the Soviet-US summit meeting in Reykjavik.

The confrontation policy cannot ensure peace and security. This is why the USSR's call for jointly seeking for ways to promote peace, security and cooperation in Asia and in the Pacific zone is particularly topical. The peoples of that area of the world are interested in a coordinated approach to regional issues.

The Soviet Union proposes that disputable questions be resolved through bilateral consultations, that mutual confidence be built and prerequisites for holding an Asian forum, on the pattern of the Helsinki Conference, be gradually created so that a joint search for constructive solutions could be started.

In doing so, it is necessary to take into account the specifics of the Asian-Pacific region. We do not mean mechanical transfer of European experience onto Asian soil. We mean implementation, with due account for the Helsinki experience, of the principles which were evolved by the Asian peoples themselves.

The concept of Asian security did not come out of thin air. As Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India stated, the *Panchsheel*, Bandung and non-aligned principles which Mikhail Gorbachev cited in his Vladivostok speech form a theoretical and political basis for analysing the complicated and specific issues relating to peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific area.

The Soviet-Indian summit talks in New Delhi gave a powerful impetus to the positive processes in Asia. By their example the USSR and India help assert the principles of peaceful co-existence, hamper the tendencies leading to a nuclear catastrophe, and show a real possibility of countering neoglobalism and the expansionist ambitions of imperialism.

The Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World, signed

by the leaders of the two countries, is a graphic illustration of a new political thinking. A nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world requires specific and immediate action, the Delhi Declaration says. Nuclear arsenals should be completely destroyed before the end of this century, all weapons barred from outer space, nuclear weapons tests banned, development of new types of mass destruction weapons prohibited, the stockpiles of chemical weapons destroyed, and the levels of conventional arms and armed forces reduced.

Implementation of all these peace initiatives and translation of the Delhi Declaration principles into reality would radically improve the situation in the Asian-Pacific region. If a nuclear-weapon-free world became a universal political landmark, this would create favourable conditions for eliminating a bridgehead of neoglobalism—the foreign military bases on the territory of states in Asia and in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins.

Evolving a concept of Asian security on the basis of nuclear disarmament is a long-term objective but such factors as the growing prestige of the non-aligned movement, the upswing of the anti-nuclear sentiments, and the intensified struggle for a new international economic order pave the way for its attainment.

The concept of a new international economic order is of great importance in the struggle against neoglobalism. It is based on the idea of an imperative need of democratising international economic relations and doing away with the actual inequality of the newly-free countries in this sphere, of setting up a mechanism for countering the *diktat* of the transnational corporations and an international mechanism for regulating international economic relations with a view to controlling market fluctuations.

Holding global negotiations on the cardinal issues of economic development, trade and currency-financial relations could help implement the idea of a new international economic order. The imperialist powers, supporting the idea in words, advance such conditions which, in effect, block them. The obstructionist policy of the transnationals and the countries where they are based hinders the implementation of the UN resolution on a new international economic order.

Furthermore, in the past few years the capitalist states have tried to adopt a tougher attitude to the demands by developing countries and even to switch to an aggressive tactic in negotiations with them. This explains the absence of real progress in restructuring international economic relations and ensuring normal conditions for Asian, African and Latin American development.

In their struggle for restructuring economic relations *the emergent states are supported by the countries of the socialist community.* The growing trade and economic relations of socialist countries with the newly-free states, relations in which the ideas of a new international economic order are being put into practice, are an effective means for attaining the objectives of a new international economic order. As distinct from the imperialist powers, the socialist states build their trade and economic relations on the principles of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in home affairs.

Trade and economic relations between socialist and developing states are an example of international relations of a new type between countries with different development levels and social systems. These relations make an ever greater contribution to the efforts of the Asian, African and Latin American countries to overcome backwardness and to establish a modern

multi-sectoral economy, to improve the living standards of the broad masses and to carry out progressive social and economic changes.

To date, over 5,000 enterprises have been built with technical and economic assistance of socialist countries in more than 100 emergent states, mainly in key industries and in the public sector. Trade between the socialist community member countries and developing states reached nearly 77,000 million dollars in 1985. The existing long-term agreements on trade, economic and scientific-technical cooperation ensure to the newly-free countries stable marketing for many years to come.

So, for the Asian, African and Latin American countries trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries becomes a major factor for acceleration of their socio-economic development and fortifies the position of developing countries in the struggle against neoglobalism, against the imperialist exploitation by transnational corporations.

CONCLUSION

History shows that the last century's American expansion has, as it were, paved the way to the US imperialist adventures of the post-war years and then to the neoglobalist policy of our days. So, the aims which neoglobalism pursues are far from being new. This is the same old imperial policy generated by the yearning for world domination, by the hatred of socialism. Being a doctrine of international brigandage, neoglobalism is particularly dangerous to newly-free countries.

The operation of the multinationals, which are the vanguard of neoglobalism, in the Asian, African and Latin American countries spells deep-going adverse social and economic consequences. The dependence of the emergent states on the main centres of imperialism grows stronger. This dependence acquires ever more sophisticated forms and is continually modified. The ever more intensive exploitation of developing countries increases the outflow of financial resources from them into the countries where the TNCs are headquartered. The sums which the transnationals syphon out from the emergent states exceed by far their investments in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The developed capitalist countries try to lay the burden of economic crises onto the newly-free countries. This slows down the latter's economic

growth, reduces their export receipts, intensifies the inflation processes, boosts unemployment, and increases social inequality. The TNCs have become the main channel for transferring crisis phenomena to developing countries.

The imperialist powers use the foreign-debt burden to exert political and economic pressure on the young states. The transnationals of the munitions industry of the USA and other NATO countries draw developing countries into the arms race which is burdensome to them. The growing military expenditures of the Asian, African and Latin American countries divert sizeable material, manpower and intellectual resources from the development programmes and hamper progressive changes.

As it was noted during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to India, the development rate of the emergent states and the overcoming by them of the difficulties inherited from the past largely depend on whether they will be able to counter neoglobalism which is the main obstacle to world progress. Resolution of the global issues of disarmament and development, pressing as they are for the countries of Asia and the Pacific, will largely depend on this.

WORLD & YOU series

- o **SOVIET N-TEST MORATORIUM AND ASIA**
by Girish Mathur
- o **NAM: INFLUENTIAL FORCE IN WORLD POLITICS**
by Vladimir Vykhukholev
- o **SOVIET MORATORIUM AND SECURITY
IN ASIA-PACIFIC**
by Alexander Pushkin
- o **DISARMAMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT**
by Alexander Portnyagin
- o **SEVEN QUESTIONS AFTER REYKJAVIK**
by Mikhail Goryanov
- o **FOR THE WORLD WITHOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS**
by Sadhan Mikherjee
- o **REYKJAVIK SUMMIT AND PEACE IN ASIA**
- o **USSR AND THE ASIAN PERSPECTIVE**
by Subrata Banerjee
- o **DISARMAMENT AND NON-ALIGNMENT**
by D.R. Goyal
- o **WESTERN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**
by Girish Mishra
- o **NUCLEAR MORATORIUM AND ASIAN SECURITY**
by Vasili Morozov

- o **AFGHANISTAN TODAY**
- o **INFORMATION AND NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD**
by Eduard Baskakov
- o **HUMAN RIGHTS: TWO ATTITUDES**
by Vsevolod Sofinsky
- o **FROM PEACE ZONES TO A PEACE PLANET**
by Bakhtiyar Tuzmukhamedov
- o **USSR-ESCAP 40 YEARS OF COOPERATION**
by a group of Soviet experts
- o **IN THE LAND OF AFGHANS**
by Anil Narendra
- o **CMEA AND ASIA**
by N. Kudryashov and A. Polikanov
- o **A N-FREE NON-VIOLENT WORLD**
by Alexander Gorev
- o **SOVIET PEACE STRATEGY AND ASIA**
by Y. Romyantsev
- o **SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVE: ASIAN ASPECT**
- o **DELHI DECLARATION AND ASIAN FUTURE**
by Yuri Vinogradov
- o **ASIA-PACIFIC: A YEAR AFTER VLADIVOSTOK**
- o **FROM PEACE DECREE TO PROGRAMME OF
N-WEAPONS ELIMINATION**
by Sergei Kuznetsov
- o **STAR WARS LEAD TO INSANE ARMS RACE**
by Vladimir Chernyshev



Vladimir Andrianov, 35, is a graduate from the Institute of Asian and African Countries, under the Moscow State University. His field of interest is international socio-economic relations.

Andrianov has been frequently contributing comments and articles to Soviet and foreign journals on problems related to his speciality.

Currently, he is on the staff of the All-Union Institute of Market Research, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade.



NAM & STRUGGLE FOR PEACE & DISARMAMENT

Nonalignment contributes greatly to the
formation of new political thinking

**NAM & STRUGGLE
FOR PEACE &
DISARMAMENT**

NAM & STRUGGLE FOR PEACE & DISARMAMENT



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

**NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS BANGALORE
HYDERABAD AHMEDABAD LUCKNOW**

CONTENTS

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1 | ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION |
| 3 | NAM—AN ANTINUCLEAR MOVEMENT |
| 8 | NEW MODE OF THINKING IN THE
NUCLEAR AGE |
| 12 | ANTIWAR ACTIVITY—A COHESIVE
FACTOR |
| 16 | AGAINST NEOGLOBALISM AND
TERRORISM |
| 21 | RESTRUCTURING WORLD ECONOMIC
TIES |
| 25 | THE PRINCIPLED STAND OF THE USSR |

"We highly assess the stand of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Harare on questions pertaining to the nuclear danger, as well as the nonaligned movement's unique contribution to international development; we are confident that this contribution will steadily grow."

Mikhail Gorbachev

ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION

The priority issue of the day—the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, and real disarmament—was the centre-piece of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held in August-September 1986 in Harare, capital of the Republic of Zimbabwe. Virtually each address at the Harare forum, attended by delegations of over 100 countries and national-liberation movements, echoed an appeal to step up the fight against the nuclear threat.

All Soviet people share the concern of the public in the nonaligned countries and that of progressive world public for the future of the planet. The USSR is making vigorous efforts to preserve peace on earth, working closely in concert with the authoritative force that the nonaligned movement is. A graphic evidence of this was the official friendly visit to India of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, his talks with Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi and the documents they signed.

In a round-table discussion Novosti Press Agency asked leading experts to share their views of the role played by the nonaligned movement in today's world. The participants were: Professor Rais Tuzmukhamedov, D.Sc. (Law); Professor Alexander Chicherov, D.Sc. (History); Yakov Etinger, D.Sc. (History); Professor

Mai Volkov, D.Sc. (Economics); Lev Klochkovsky, D.Sc. (Economics); and Sergei Sinitsyn, department head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The round-table moderator was Professor Karen Khachaturov, D.Sc. (History), APN Board Deputy Chairman.

K.A. Khachaturov: The aim of the discussion is to acquaint world public opinion, above all in the Third World countries, as extensively as possible with the Soviet view-point on the role played by the nonaligned movement on such fundamental issues as the struggle for peace and disarmament, for the survival of mankind. The Harare conference definitively proved once again that this role is a substantial one. The documents that were signed as a result of the visit to India of Mikhail Gorbachev, above all the "Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World", are graphic proof of how concurrent and close are today the stands of the USSR and the nonaligned movement in the fight to forestall the nuclear catastrophe hanging over the world.

Allow me to give the floor to Professor Rais Tuzmukhamedov, Doctor of Law.

NAM—AN ANTINUCLEAR MOVEMENT

Prof. Rais Tuzmukhamedov: I would like to point out that the "Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World" which you have just mentioned was signed by the leaders of the largest socialist and the largest nonaligned power on behalf of a thousand million people living in these two countries. It is also addressed to the peoples of the entire planet. The Declaration dwells on a ban on nuclear weapons and on the orbiting of any weapons. In effect, it is aimed against the American SDI as well

The concurrence of stands of the socialist countries and the nonaligned movement on these issues is not a new phenomenon. Since its emergence the nonaligned movement has been opposed to the use of force in world politics. Working for disarmament, it initially set out its stand against nuclear weapons. Back in 1961, the Belgrade Declaration of the first nonaligned summit stated that "general and complete disarmament must include the complete prohibition of the production, possession and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons" and other means of mass destruction (Paragraph 16). As to the sources of this stand, however, we should turn to a still earlier time. After the end of the Second World War the Soviet Union resolutely spoke in favour of the "prohibition of the

production and use of atomic energy for military purposes" (UN, 1946). Almost simultaneously in India, Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the originators of the idea of nonalignment, took up the fight against this threat.

Speaking in December 1947 at the Constituent Assembly as the first Prime Minister of independent India, he stated: "Today the world has been put before a choice which it has never faced before. It is a choice between self-destruction and survival. Many people reflect and say that to avoid the horrors of nuclear war one must dig oneself into the ground and live like a rat in a hole. It is indeed a strange conception of our time if we are offered such a path instead of directing all our energy and all our strength at the prevention of this catastrophe".

I consider these words very significant, as they express with total clarity the idea of the trend in foreign policy that stands opposed to force. It is through such a concept of international relations free of violence that the participants in the nonaligned movement subsequently proceeded to the notion of its anti-bloc edge.

The concept of nonalignment, which appeared with the advent of the nuclear-missile age was, in my view, also largely the developing world's reaction to the global nuclear threat being posed by the United States. This definitely manifested itself as early as the conference of Afro-Asian countries held in 1955 in Bandung. In the Final Communique of this conference it was stressed that "disarmament and the prohibition of the production, experiments with and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons are entirely necessary for saving mankind and civilisation from fear and the prospect of total annihilation".

I venture asserting that today the nonaligned movement is above all an antinuclear movement. Truly

so. The demands to eliminate nuclear weapons and use nuclear energy only for peaceful purposes that were formulated back in Belgrade in 1961 have remained invariable ever since.

This trend has today become one of the guidelines for the non-aligned movement, and its consistent antinuclear stand has actually turned into a new criterion of the "nonaligned" status. Another point that bears this out is that all the political documents of the movement's main forums invariably express a common demand of the participant countries to eliminate nuclear weapons and other means of mass annihilation.

It is highly important that the antinuclear course of the nonaligned movement stands out not only for its initiative, but also for its great dynamism. Is this not shown by the movement's reaction to the drastic worsening of the international situation following the arrival of the Reagan Administration in the USA and especially after it adopted the SDI (Star Wars) programme? At their seventh summit in Delhi, the heads of state and government of the nonaligned countries focused attention on the mounting nuclear threat. "Disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, has ceased to be a moral problem—it is a problem of the survival of mankind", they stated with concern. The conferees declared that they "rejected all theories and concepts presupposing possession of nuclear weapons and their use under any circumstances" (Paragraph 28). The conference called upon all the nuclear powers to reach agreement on the prohibition of the use or threat of nuclear weapons and to freeze their development, stockpiling and deployment.

The USA is nurturing plans to put nuclear and other weapons in outer space. As this danger grows, the nonaligned countries collectively voice their opposition to it. At the eighth conference held in Harare, they urged

an end to the development of antisatellite weapons, the elimination of the existing systems, and a ban on the orbiting of weapons. Particularly important is the stand of the nonaligned movement and its efforts to see that "the existing treaties that uphold the principle of peaceful use of outer space, and also the 1972 treaty limiting anti-ballistic missile systems are fully complied with, and are enhanced and extended, if necessary, in the light of the latest technical advances".

The participants in the Harare conference acclaimed the all-embracing programme proposed by the Soviet Union for the stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament, which Mikhail Gorbachev advanced on January 15, 1986. We might add that today the movement vigorously advocates the creation of nuclear-free zones in many parts of the world and promotes other efforts to prevent nuclear war and effect nuclear disarmament.

Thus, we have every right to say that a sixth principle has been added to the five well-known principles which have characterised the nonaligned movement from the outset—the anti-nuclear stand of each of its participants. I feel that without this there are no nonaligned countries, nor can there be any.

K.A. Khachaturov: I would like to call attention to one new tendency. Whereas in the past Third World countries which bought or themselves produced weapons and in this manner took part in the arms race, paid only for their own weapons, today, with Reagan's SDI under implementation, imperialism will be squeezing enormous funds out of these countries for America's nuclear programmes as well. Economists estimate the cost of SDI at three times the current debt of the developing countries. This is a new huge burden which the imperialists want to shift on to the nonaligned countries today.

So, a new basis for the fight against this programme is being created as well. The new situation also requires a new way of thinking, which I will ask Professor Alexander Chicherov to elucidate.

NEW MODE OF THINKING IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Prof: Alexander Chicherov: Indeed, such a situation obviously requires a new way of thinking on the part of the developing countries. And not of them alone.

As it was noted in Mikhail Gorbachev's message of greetings to Robert G. Mugabe, Chairman of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries, "at present the nonaligned movement, by resolutely coming out against war and the arms race, and for the abandonment of the use of force in resolving international problems, is making an important contribution to the formation of the new political thinking which corresponds to the realities of the nuclear and space age".

This wording was not to be found either in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress or in the new edition of the Party Programme. This bespeaks the fact that the Soviet perception of the role the nonaligned movement plays in the modern world is not stagnant, that this perception is a constantly evolving process. It applies equally to our approach to the interdependence of the world. Today one cannot ensure one's own security disregarding the security of others, whether of the USSR, the USA or the member-countries of the nonaligned movement.

The USSR constantly displays this new way of

thinking, one that accords with the needs of the times. Today it is displayed to a much greater extent by the developing countries than by the West. It is in this sense that the documents signed in Delhi, specifically, the Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World became a model of this new political thinking displayed by the leading nonaligned country—India.

Elements of this mentality have been persistently traced throughout the history of the nonaligned movement. Revealing in this sense is the Harare Appeal to the leaders of two great powers—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and US President Ronald Reagan. "Never before," it reads, "has mankind been so close to self-destruction. Indeed, today a choice has to be made not between peace and war, but between life and death. This makes the struggle for peace and the prevention of nuclear war the priority task of our time."

Professor Tuzmukhamedov was entirely correct when he said that still another fundamental feature of the nonaligned movement has in effect been formulated giving a new dimension to antinuclear and antiwar policy.

Speaking about the need for a new way of thinking in our day I feel it important also to touch upon the question of the "equidistance" of the nonaligned movement from the two blocs. Of course, there are many fair points made in the criticism of such a stand. Indeed, we sometimes find it difficult to agree with the belief that one can equally distance oneself from the international policy of the socialist and the capitalist countries, which pursue such different goals. However, reality should be seen as it is. The reality is—this is my view, naturally—that the movement is guided by criteria which it elaborates itself, independently.

other forces. Nor does it "lean" to anyone's side, but pursues a policy which meets its interests.

In 1983 official quarters in Washington assessed the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries held in Delhi as "a one-sided unbalanced document," as evidence of the nonaligned countries' "tilt" toward the Soviet Union. This accusation was categorically repudiated by the then Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, who following the Delhi summit became chairperson of the nonaligned movement. We have no "tilt" toward the USSR, she emphasised. The Soviet Union supports us, which is why some of our interests coincide.

The Indian Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, voiced the same thought in a talk with me in Harare. I asked him for his opinion of the slander campaign going apace in the West against the the nonaligned movement, and of the calculations popular with the current Washington administration as to the number of times the nonaligned countries vote in the UN together with the USSR against the USA. Mr. Gandhi stated: "We vote in accordance with our principles. If the Soviet Union or the United States vote together with us, it is very good, we are very pleased. If they do not vote with us, sooner or later they will come to an understanding of the fairness of our point of view. It is for this reason that we do not vote with anyone. We vote with ourselves. Our principles are our philosophy. We stand by them and will keep on standing by them."

This movement's strength lies precisely in its independence.

Sergei Sinitsyn: I believe a very interesting point has been made. The entire activity of the nonaligned countries attests to the fact that they independently choose or support those ideas and proposals they

consider to be consonant with their interests. The Harare conference is characteristic in this respect. Its decisions contain a positive assessment of Soviet policy and our initiatives. That the nonaligned movement recognises the nuclear disarmament programme advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev as being in accordance with its goals can be considered a major advance in the movement's activity.

The participants in the Harare conference denounced the USA on a wide range of issues and called upon that country to join the Soviet moratorium. It is in this approach of the member-countries of the nonaligned movement that their vigorous striving to find their own solutions to the most pressing problems of the day is manifest.

By the same token I agree with Professor Chicherov that it would likewise be incorrect to dramatize the so-called equidistance position, to present it as a stumbling block in our cooperation with the nonaligned movement.

K.A. Khachaturov: On the whole, the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries truly demonstrated elements of the new political thinking. It was particularly manifest during the meetings and talks between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi. I think that it would also be fair to note here that both sides displayed this way of thinking in equal measure. And this corroborates Professor Chicherov's words to the effect that it is not someone's monopoly. It is extremely important today for the cohesion of all peace forces capable of such thinking.

ANTIWAR ACTIVITY—A COHESIVE FACTOR

Y. Etinger: The enhanced cohesion of the whole spectrum of peace forces in the international arena is a sign of the times. This process is characterised as follows in the Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World: "The gathering strength of the Coalition for Peace, embracing the efforts of the Nonaligned Movement, the 'Six-Nation Five-Continent Initiative for Peace and Disarmament', all peace-loving countries, political parties and public organisations, gives us reason for hope and optimism."

The nonaligned movement figures prominently in this coalition. It was in this movement that the group of six countries which came to be known as the Delhi Six took shape. These countries represent political forces that are different by virtue of the international status—the nonaligned movement in the person of its leading countries, European neutral states and antiwar circles in NATO countries.

Within the framework of this association the nonaligned countries were the nucleus around which it was formed. India with Indira Gandhi as its Prime Minister was the initiator of this group. The current Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, continued this initiative. As a result, the Delhi Six turned into a standing forum of

the leaders of India, Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden—countries representing different continents.

The Delhi Six is an operative, very flexible formation whose activity is concentrated on problems of vital concern to mankind—the problems of peace, disarmament and the prevention of the militarisation of outer space. Another feature of it is that it is headed by prominent political and state leaders who enjoy high international prestige.

Typically, one of the organisers of the Delhi Six—Olof Palme—was the leader of a neutral European country—Sweden. Rather substantial changes have taken place in the nature of European neutrality over the past 10 to 15 years. First of all, traditionally non-military, it has become predominantly antinuclear. This definitely united the neutral countries, Sweden included, with the nonaligned countries. And secondly, keen interest in the problems of the developing countries became typical of the European neutrals—and this particularly applied to Olof Palme. This outstanding political figure vigorously supported the effort for a democratic restructuring of international economic relations and advocated a peaceful settlement of conflict situations in various parts of the globe, including the Middle East, Latin America and Southern Africa. Thus, the anticolonial, antiracist aspect of European neutrality that came to the fore in recent years created the basis on which the unique forum of the "Delhi Six" could take shape.

United by their conviction of the need to prevent nuclear war, the leaders of the six countries in their very first joint declaration, in May 1984, proposed as a first step "to cease the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, to be immediately followed by a substantial reduction in

nuclear forces". In its reply the Soviet leadership stated that it unconditionally espoused a viewpoint identical to that of the authors of the declaration—nuclear war should not be permitted in any form.

In the Delhi Declaration adopted in January 1985 at the conference of heads of state and government of the six countries, the conclusion of a treaty on an all-round ban on nuclear weapons testing is viewed as a paramount task. The authors of the declaration called upon the nuclear powers to immediately halt tests on all types of nuclear weapons and conclude a treaty as soon as possible on their complete prohibition. This treaty, the declaration reads, could become a major step forward and put an end to the on-going modernisation of nuclear arsenals.

In early August 1986 in the Mexican town of Ixtapa the leaders of the Delhi Six adopted the Mexican Declaration, which stood apart for the scope and acuity with which pressing global problems were posed. It was an important antiwar document, showing as it did the complete untenability of the stand of the West, which is foisting the idea that the problems of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, are supposedly the exclusive prerogative of the nuclear powers.

As the leaders of the six countries emphasised, "the difference between strong and weak countries is meaningless in the struggle for survival. For this reason we are firmly resolved to see that countries which, like our countries, do not possess nuclear arsenals, take an active part in all aspects of the disarmament effort. Responsibility for the protection of our planet lies with all the nations living on it."

The Delhi Six thus showed that the nonaligned states and the other peaceloving countries working together with them do more than come forth with appeals for peace and a reduction of the most destructive types of

weapons. They are prepared to work for a treaty between the two biggest nuclear powers on the prohibition of nuclear tests and to furnish assistance in its implementation.

In his address to the Indian Parliament on November 27, 1986, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke highly of the activity of the Delhi Six and of India in particular. "The Soviet programme, proclaimed on January 15, of a stage-by-stage elimination of all nuclear weapons and other mass-annihilation means by the end of the century, the concept of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security, our moratorium on nuclear explosions and the set of other peace initiatives—all this, as we understand it," Mikhail Gorbachev stated, "is consonant with the line of the Delhi Six, with India's faith in common sense, and in the possibility of ensuring peace and progress for the present generation and the generations to come"

K.A. Khachaturov: In August 1986 I was in Ixtapa at the proceedings of the Delhi Six, and I truly felt its great antiwar potential, which Dr. Ettinger has talked about here.

AGAINST NEOGLOBALISM AND TERRORISM

M. Volkov: The principles of peaceful coexistence cannot be consolidated and a world without coercion and war cannot be built without abandonment of the policy of neoglobalism, without the elimination of various methods of implementing it, specifically such a repulsive one as international terrorism.

Elaborated and being extensively carried out in the world by the US administration, the strategy of neoglobalism is the capsulisation of the policy of imperialism at the present-day stage and pursues the goal of world domination. Today it is an instrument of struggle against all states following the progressive path of development. With its aid the USA is striving to destroy progressive regimes in Nicaragua and Angola, in Afghanistan and Cuba, and is propping up reactionary regimes and military fascist dictatorships in South Africa, Chile, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras and Paraguay.

Confident of its impunity and flagrantly violating international laws, Washington is provoking dangerous military adventures. One example is the instigation of a fratricidal war between Iran and Iraq and the illegal arms deliveries to Iran, which developed into another political scandal in the USA, named the "Irangate". However, it, too, evidently taught the American

administration little. "We are expanding our possibilities for the use of force any place we need to," US defence secretary Caspar Weinberger cynically stated in a recent interview with the CBS broadcasting company

The nonaligned movement has always stood opposed to coercion in international relations. It is consistently working to ease tension and consolidate peace and peaceful coexistence. As the participants in the Harare forum stated in this connection in their Political Declaration, they intend to strive for the "elimination of hotbeds of tension, aggression and conflicts, a just and peaceful settlement of international controversies, general and complete disarmament, the preservation of peace on a just basis, and also the elimination of all types of domination, discrimination, exploitation and inequality".

In this connection, the participants of the Harare forum also demanded that international terrorism be uprooted. The conferees focused in particular on the need to put an end to political and economic terrorism. I feel that the very fact that Zimbabwe, one of the countries that are called "frontline states" was chosen to host this forum is a resolute protest on the part of the nonaligned countries against the imperialist policy of political and economic terrorism.

None of the speakers who addressed the Harare conference failed to touch upon the aggressive actions of the racist South African regime against the neighbouring countries. Almost one-fourth of the Political Declaration deals with this question. The conferees also denounced neoglobalism, which was defined as the export of counter-revolution by methods of state-sponsored terrorism.

The imperialist states resort to this type of terrorism wherever the peoples independently make their political and social choice and themselves map out the path of

their development—in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Tiny Grenada, at which the USA hurled its military might, became a victim of US state-sponsored terrorism in Latin America in 1983. The USA has been pursuing a policy of state-sponsored terrorism against Nicaragua for a long time now. The peoples of the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, Southern and Southeast Asia, and the insular states of the Indian and Pacific oceans suffer from this policy, too. However, it is in Africa that state-sponsored political and economic terrorism has become most widespread. On the north of the continent, Libya has become one of its victims. In the south, the racist South African regime supported by the USA and other imperialist countries, is resorting to extremely ruthless state-sponsored terrorism against the African peoples both within its state borders and beyond.

The manifestations of state-sponsored terrorism in South African policy are multifaceted. One example is the military and economic support in the 1960s of separatist actions on the territory of present-day Zaire, and of separatists in Nigeria who unleashed a civil war there which cost no less than a million lives. Another example is the repeated armed incursions into Angola and other states in the south of Africa. Still another example is the attempts on life and assassinations of leaders of the liberation movement and of governments of African countries. It is not for nothing that the African people unanimously consider South Africa involved in the tragic death of Samora Machel, the President of Mozambique, on October 19, 1986.

Finally, the piratical attacks of South African saboteurs on various facilities on foreign territories, the arming and training of antigovernment terrorist bands, acts of sabotage and much else have become systematic. Economic terrorism is being carried out in wide-ranging forms, covert ones included. Thus, in the early 1980s the

South African government arbitrarily restricted the haulage volume of freight from Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Zambia on South African railways, terminated the right of entry for migrant workers from Zimbabwe and Mozambique, limited import, reduced deliveries of foodstuffs and liquid fuel to these countries, halted supplies of electricity to Lesotho, Mozambique, etc. During the 1980-1985 period the overall economic damage South Africa had caused to its neighbours amounted to between 16,000 and 17,000 million dollars.

The aggressive actions of South Africa in Angola and Mozambique led to greater economic difficulties. A number of economic facilities, including rural water supply systems, medical institutions and schools, were destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of people were left homeless in regions affected by the aggression, and many were forced to become refugees, their number totalling five million.

The only reason why South African widescale state-sponsored terrorism against African peoples became possible was that it is organically bound up with the overall system of imperialist state-sponsored terrorism, which has taken on a global nature.

The fight against this dangerous phenomenon requires that all peaceloving progressives rally their forces. It demands a coordinating of stands in this issue, specifically, the stands of the socialist countries and the nonaligned member-countries. "As to terrorism, our principled stand is known worldwide—we are categorically inimical to it," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev said at a press conference in Delhi. "We are decidedly against terrorism in any form, especially when it assumes the form of state-sponsored terrorism." Elaboration of effective methods of preventing international terrorism

is envisaged by the system of all-embracing international security, the idea for which was advanced at the 27th CPSU Congress in the Political Report of Mikhail Gorbachev.

The nonaligned movement, too, stands firmly opposed to international terrorism. At the Harare conference, for example, this problem was dealt with in a special section of the Political Declaration. Voicing their concern over terrorist acts, including state-sponsored terrorism in all its forms, the Harare forum denounced "all types of terrorist activity carried out by individuals, groups and states, and resolved to fight such activity with all the legitimate means available." They stressed, however, that the legitimate struggle which the people are waging for their liberation from colonialism and oppressors can in no way be considered terrorism or be equated with it. The conferees sharply condemned the use and the activity of mercenaries, who "are one of the key elements of international terrorism and represent an international crime".

Countering of international terrorism is a component of the overall struggle against the imperialist policy of coercion and militarism. It is conditioned by the very spirit of the nonaligned movement. It should be stressed that the tasks being advanced by the nonaligned movement of transforming a number of world regions such as the South Atlantic, Asia and the Pacific, the Indian Ocean, etc., into zones of peace fully accords with the fight against international terrorism as well.

People cannot live in tranquillity as long as international terrorism exists. And the struggle against it is indivisible from the overall struggle of the peoples for the establishment of a lasting peace and international security.

RESTRUCTURING WORLD ECONOMIC TIES

L.L. Klochkovsky: The question of restructuring international economic relations and establishing a new international economic order was a focal point for the nonaligned movement in the past, too. However, I feel that in Harare this theme acquired particular urgency. This was due above all to the drastic worsening of the economic position of the developing countries in recent years. Never before have they encountered such economic difficulties. Serious stagnation or even a decline in production is typical of many of them.

In the period between the seventh and eighth conferences of the nonaligned movement the proportion of developing countries in the world industrial production stood at less than 12 per cent. Agriculture failed to meet the needs of a growing population. A particularly acute situation took shape in the foreign-economic sphere. Foreign trade turnover of the developing states declined sharply over the 1980-1985 period, their exports decreasing by almost 40 per cent, and imports by 30 per cent. The foreign debt reached huge proportions—approximately one trillion dollars. In 1985 alone, 122,000 million dollars were spent to liquidate the foreign debt. Practically more than one-fourth of all exports revenues of the developing countries went to pay off their external debt. For

individual countries this proportion was considerably higher (Bolivia spent 60 per cent of its 1985 export income to pay off its foreign debt, Argentina—55 per cent, Chile—47 per cent, and Brazil—44 per cent).

Taking advantage of the present economic situation in the developing world, international monopoly capital is bringing greater pressure to bear on the young states. The attempts by the imperialist powers to interfere in the developing countries' internal affairs are becoming increasingly aggressive. And, as Dr. Volkov noted, this interference is usually an outright manifestation of state-sponsored economic terrorism. As we can see, the two questions are closely intertwined.

Under monopoly pressure protectionist trends are intensifying in the trade policy of the developed capitalist states. The developing countries are encountering greater obstacles in marketing their goods as a result. Particularly strong trends are observed in the USA. As experts of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean Basin noted recently, "in the USA there is a marked trend toward intensified protectionism. . . There are bills up for consideration in the US Congress that threaten many developing countries with new tariff and non-tariff restrictions". The West is trying to use, among other things, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as an instrument of interference in the developing countries' internal affairs. Through its so-called "stabilizing programmes" which are being imposed upon the developing countries, the latter are being impelled to scale down the state sector, reduce social spending and provide fresh privileges and concessions to foreign capital. Under IMF pressure a number of nonaligned countries have already set about selling out state-run enterprises to private capital, foreign included.

It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the reasons

for the sharp criticism which was levelled in Harare at the economic policy of the industrialised capitalist countries, the USA first and foremost. The nonaligned countries denounced the intensifying capitalist exploitation to which they are being subjected, qualifying it as the main obstacle to the emergent peoples' economic and social development. "The truth," said the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe Robert Mugabe, "is that the economy of the developing South is subsidizing the economy of the industrialised North". The President of Peru Alan Garcia called the economic relations between the industrialized capitalist and the developing countries "*economic apartheid, in which discrimination against the poorer countries reigns*".

The direct link between development and disarmament was definitively underscored at the Harare conference. This idea of fundamental importance was advanced by representatives of many states. As Fidel Castro pointed out, "the nonaligned countries, which throughout their history were subjected to colonial oppression, and now to neocolonialist plunder, need not only peace, but also a rechanneling of the funds now being allocated for destruction into development". It was stated in the Economic Declaration adopted by the conference that the arms race, the nuclear arms race in particular, is spawning a dangerous instability. The conferees called for an immediate cessation of the arms race, which would release enormous manpower, financial and technical resources for development.

On the whole, the discussion of the question of establishing a new international economic order at the Harare forum showed that the contradictions between the developing countries and imperialism had become more acute. It showed something else, too. The nonaligned movement is becoming increasingly aware of

the need to proceed from statements and declarations to concrete, decisive and consistent, anti-imperialist actions. However, the discussion in Harare also brought out the fact that some members of the nonaligned movement often give in to imperialist pressure and make concessions to international monopoly capital. This accounts for the compromise nature of a number of important provisions of the Economic Declaration adopted in Harare (specifically, on questions of foreign debt and relations with transnational corporations).

However, lasting peace and stability in Asia, Africa and Latin America can hardly be expected without genuinely restructuring international relations between the developing countries and the capitalist world, without rendering them equitable and mutually beneficial. The nonaligned countries face a long and difficult road of struggle to establish the principles of equality and justice in international economic relations and consolidate their political sovereignty and economic self-sufficiency.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned it is prepared to render all-round support to these countries in accomplishing these tasks. This readiness was once again demonstrated during the visit of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to India. The USSR and India came out for a decisive restructuring of international economic relations on the principles of justice, for the elimination of the arms race and for the use of senselessly wasted resources for the benefit of mankind, for progress in the developing world.

THE PRINCIPLED STAND OF THE USSR

S. Sinitsyn: Underlying the Soviet Union's relations with the *nonaligned movement* is its traditional solidarity with the peoples' struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism, for their national liberation and independent development along their chosen path, with their struggle for peace and security, for equitable international cooperation.

It is appropriate to note here that the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the 70th anniversary of which is being observed this year, was more than a powerful catalyst for the national-liberation movement. It fundamentally changed the character of relations among peoples and states and imparted to them a way of political thinking that was new for the times. It was the Soviet state that for the first time proclaimed and began to establish in practice the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems. The principles of complete equality and respect for the rights and aspirations of the oppressed nations and the young emergent countries were manifest in its very first treaties with Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran. The Soviet Union viewed them not as an object of great-power politics that was customary for the imperialist powers, but as independent, equal partners. Lenin's "mandates" to the first Soviet diplomats in the

Eastern countries were likewise permeated with the new political thinking. Following these "mandates", People's Commissar (Minister) for Foreign Affairs G.V. Chicherin noted in his instruction to the Soviet plenipotentiary in Afghanistan in 1921: "Our policy is a policy of peace and cooperation among all peoples. At the present time, when the Eastern peoples, as economically backward, painfully feel foreign economic oppression, socialist Soviet Russia is a natural friend to them. . . . Proceeding from our desire to promote the development and flourishing of the friendly Afghan state as much as possible, we are prepared to extend to it all the assistance we can in this peaceful field".

Today, 66 years later, the consistency and continuity of this principled approach are borne out by the following statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev during his recent visit to India: "Afghanistan is our neighbour. During all regimes we have had good relations with it." The Soviet leader further noted: "We are for an Afghanistan that is nonaligned, independent, sovereign, that uses as it sees fit all the resources at its disposal and all that belongs to it, we are for a neutral Afghanistan. Whatever regime is there is the concern of the Afghan people".

I would like to make a second point. A characteristic feature of our relations with the emergent, nonaligned countries has always been the furnishing of real support, material as well as moral and political, in their efforts to defend their independence from the aggressive intrigues of the forces of imperialism and reaction, to build a national economy and develop culture. Soviet aid played an important role in the formation of People's Republic of Mongolia and People's Republic of China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, socialist Vietnam and Cuba, Ethiopia, Angola and other states. It would be incorrect, however, to forget that the USSR

has also been rendering substantial assistance to countries that have chosen another path of socio-economic development. The Aswan Dam in Egypt, the construction of a metallurgical works in Nigeria, the steel plant at Bhilai, India, are but a few examples.

The long-standing relations between the USSR and India, which were so impressively manifest in their variety during the Delhi visit of Mikhail Gorbachev are perhaps especially typical in this respect. Widescale, versatile, geared to the future, including the field of space exploration—this is what underlies Soviet-Indian cooperation.

And a third point. The Soviet Union builds its relations with the developing countries with due consideration for their unification within the framework of the nonaligned movement and their adherence to the principles of this movement and to the decisions they have jointly adopted. The USSR has supported the nonaligned movement from the very outset. This principled line of its foreign policy was also reflected in the new edition of the Party Programme adopted at the 27th CPSU Congress: “. . . The CPSU regards with understanding the goals and activities of the nonaligned movement and stands for an enhancement of its role in world politics. The USSR will continue to be on the side of the nonaligned states in the struggle against the forces of aggression and hegemonism and for settling disputes and conflicts that arise through negotiations, and will be opposed to the involvement of those states in military and political groupings”.

Assessing the role of the nonaligned movement in the present-day world, Mikhail Gorbachev noted in his message to the Eighth Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Harare that “we view the nonaligned movement for all the

diversity of its participants, as a mighty force countering war and aggression, imperialism, colonialism and racism, a force that is enhancing the potential of peace, reason and goodwill."

It is indicative that the Soviet Union has concluded political treaties on friendship and cooperation with a number of nonaligned states—India, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Angola, Syria, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, etc. These treaties in no way encroach upon their status as nonaligned countries. For example, in the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the Yemen Arab Republic of October 4, 1984 there is a special article which reads: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respects the policy of nonalignment being pursued by the Yemen Arab Republic, which is an important factor in the development of international cooperation and detente".

An important aspect of the USSR's activity on the international scene is its opposition to the attempts of the imperialist states to draw the nonaligned countries into the sphere of their "vital interests", to turn them into a field of confrontation between East and West, between the USSR and the USA. The Soviet Union fully rejects the attempts of those who would like to impose upon the USSR and the USA, the socialist community of states and the West, so-called "equal responsibility" for the dire economic state of the developing countries or for present-day world tensions, and who allege that these tensions are the result of some competition between the "two superpowers" for spheres of influence in the world. The Soviet Union is not out to place itself above other states and peoples and is not involved in such "competition".

Finally, enhancing cooperation in the international arena is becoming increasingly typical of relations between the Soviet Union and the other socialist

community countries on the one hand, and the nonaligned states on the other. Underlying this phenomenon is a growing sense of common responsibility for the future of the world and human civilisation, a community of interests of the socialist and developing countries in establishing principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-economic systems, and the similarity of approaches with the task of halting the arms race, the nuclear arms race first and foremost.

The Delhi Declaration, as well as the accords reached on a wide range of topical problems during the talks between the USSR and India attest to the great political potential offered by a consolidation of relations between the socialist and nonaligned states and their cooperation in the effort for international peace and security.

In broad international circles, particularly in the nonaligned countries, the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to India have been received with great interest and attention. They are viewed in connection with the Soviet nuclear disarmament programme of January 15, 1986 and the proposal on the creation of an all-embracing system of international security, and in the context of the new situation that has taken shape following the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik. It is rightly believed that the Delhi Declaration will have a positive impact on world politics.

K.A. Khachaturov: I would like to thank everyone for taking part in our round-table discussion and would like to express my sincere satisfaction with the fact that its participants covered our topic so extensively. It is my belief that at our discussion the nonaligned movement once again came forth as a major progressive force which, as Mikhail Gorbachev put it, has made a "unique contribution" to international development.

WORLD & YOU series

- o **SOVIET N-TEST MORATORIUM AND ASIA**
by Girish Mathur
- o **NAM: INFLUENTIAL FORCE IN WORLD POLITICS**
by Vladimir Vykhukholev
- o **SOVIET MORATORIUM AND SECURITY
IN ASIA-PACIFIC**
by Alexander Pushkin
- o **DISARMAMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT**
by Alexander Portnyagin
- o **SEVEN QUESTIONS AFTER REYKJAVIK**
by Mikhail Goryanov
- o **FOR THE WORLD WITHOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS**
by Sadhan Mikherjee
- o **REYKJAVIK SUMMIT AND PEACE IN ASIA**
- o **USSR AND THE ASIAN PERSPECTIVE**
by Subrata Banerjee
- o **DISARMAMENT AND NON-ALIGNMENT**
by D.R. Goyal
- o **WESTERN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**
by Girish Mishra
- o **NUCLEAR MORATORIUM AND ASIAN SECURITY**
by Vasili Morozov
- o **AFGHANISTAN TODAY**
- o **INFORMATION AND NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD**
by Eduard Baskakov

- o **HUMAN RIGHTS: TWO ATTITUDES**
by Vsevolod Sofinsky
- o **FROM PEACE ZONES TO A PEACE PLANET**
by Bakhtiyar Tuzmukhamedov
- o **USSR-ESCAP 40 YEARS OF COOPERATION**
by a group of Soviet experts
- o **IN THE LAND OF AFGHANS**
by Anil Narendra
- o **CMEA AND ASIA**
by N. Kudryashov and A. Polikanov
- o **A N-FREE NON-VIOLENT WORLD**
by Alexander Gorev
- o **SOVIET PEACE STRATEGY AND ASIA**
by Y. Rumyantsev
- o **SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVE: ASIAN ASPECT**
- o **DELHI DECLARATION AND ASIAN FUTURE**
by Yuri Vinogradov
- o **ASIA-PACIFIC: A YEAR AFTER VLADIVOSTOK**
- o **FROM PEACE DECREE TO PROGRAMME OF N-WEAPONS ELIMINATION**
by Sergei Kuznetsov
- o **STAR WARS LEAD TO INSANE ARMS RACE**
by Vladimir Chernyshev
- o **TNCs: STRIKE FORCE OF NEO-GLOBALISM**
by Vladimir Andrianov



ASIA-PACIFIC: PROMOTING PEACE AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

**New international relationship must
match contemporary reality**

**ASIA-PACIFIC:
PROMOTING
PEACE
AND MUTUAL
UNDERSTANDING**

MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY



105020CL

ASIA-PACIFIC: PROMOTING PEACE AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

**NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS BANGALORE
HYDERABAD AHMEDABAD LUCKNOW**

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

Prarthna Flats (1st Floor), Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

15 J.N. Heredia Marg, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400038

3-5-1129 Kachiguda Cross Road, Hyderabad 500027

Patiala House, 16A Ashok Marg, Lucknow 226001

5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700072

13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110002

751, Mount Road, Madras 600002

First Published, 1987

— CONTENTS —

- 1** **ANSWERS BY MIKHAIL S GORBACHEV
TO THE QUESTIONS OF MERDEKA**
- 19** **DEVELOPMENT OF VLADIVOSTOK
PROGRAMME**
By Y.M. Vorontsov, USSR First Deputy Foreign
Minister
- 22** **PACKAGE APPROACH**
By Prof. M. Kapitsa, President of the Soviet
Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, Director of the
Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of
Sciences
- 39** **NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT AND
STRUGGLE FOR PEACE**
By Prof. I.I. Kovalenko, Member of the
Presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity
Committee
- 48** **FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY**
By G.K. Shirokov, Deputy Director, Institute of
Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences
- 54** **THROUGH JOINT EFFORTS OF STATES IN
THE REGION**
By I.A. Rogachev, USSR Deputy Minister of
Foreign Affairs
- 56** **A YEAR AFTER VLADIVOSTOK**
Comments from Asian and Pacific Countries

Publisher's Note

Last year in the booklet *For an Integral Asia in an Integral World* that appeared in this series, we published statements by noted personalities from the Soviet Union and other countries in Asia and the Pacific. They participated in a round-table meet which was held by correspondence by Novosti Press Agency (APN), Moscow, and which dealt with a wide range of questions relating to the programme of peace and international security set forth by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in his now famous speech in Vladivostok on July 28, 1986.

The present publication includes Mikhail Gorbachev's replies to the questions of the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka* reviewing regional developments during the past year and advancing new bold peace initiatives.

Mikhail Gorbachev's replies to *Merdeka* evoked a lot of comment at home, in Asia and the Pacific and elsewhere. In Moscow, Yuli Vorontsov, USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister, spoke at a press conference arranged on this occasion. Also in Moscow, the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences organised a

conference to mark the anniversary of the Vladivostok programme of peace and cooperation. We publish excerpts from statements made at these fora and comments from other countries in the region.

ANSWERS BY MIKHAIL S. GORBACHEV TO THE QUESTIONS OF *MERDEKA*

On July 21, 1987, Mikhail S. Gorbachev received in the Kremlin the publisher and editor-in-chief of the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka*, B.M. Diah, and handed over to him his answers to the questions of the newspaper.

Mikhail S. Gorbachev and B.M. Diah had a lively discussion:

M.S. GORBACHEV. I am glad to meet you, Mr. Diah. I heard a lot about your activities. You have been engaged in journalism for more than one decade.

B.M. DIAH. I am happy to meet you, Mr. General Secretary. This is a great honour to me. Indeed, I have been in journalism for 50 years now.

M.S. GORBACHEV. This means vast experience. And experience is an asset not to be discarded, particularly if put to the right use. For instance, we, in this country, are now working to accomplish new tasks. And at this stage of our development we are constantly learning from experience and history itself.

B.M. DIAH. We pay great attention to your statements and to the processes under way in the Soviet Union.

M.S. GORBACHEV. Thank you. Have our words *perestroyka*

and *glasnost* got across to you? Can they be translated into the Indonesian language?

B.M. DIAH. These words are well known in our country and they need no translation.

M.S. GORBACHEV. In handing over to you my written answers to your questions I wish to preface them with brief but, I think, substantial observations. I am grateful to you and the editorial board of your newspaper for taking notice of the coming anniversary of my Vladivostok statement. The Soviet leadership attaches great importance to what was said in Vladivostok. We made an attempt there to articulate our policy with respect to a vast region inhabited by hundreds of millions of people. In doing so we expected that our policy would be duly understood.

I regard the questions which you have submitted as an indication of the interest that the Indonesian society takes in our policy, our assessment of the situation in Asia and the Pacific and our views on the future of the region in the context of international relations.

My comments in this connection are as follows.

We tried to take a look at the world today from a strictly scientific and realistic standpoint. The analysis we have carried out brought us to a new vision of the world and to a new policy announced at our Party Congress.

That analysis also helped us to perceive the realities which characterize the world today. And this world is much different from what it was thirty or forty years ago.

First, the accumulation of huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons has imperiled human civilization. This reality cannot be ignored. Moreover, an accurate assessment of this reality leads us to believe that today problems in international relations cannot be settled militarily. Such an approach would be fraught with unforeseeable

consequences. That means that the vision of the world and policies pursued by states need to be adjusted.

The problems which exist in the world today require joint efforts by all countries. A more general look at progress in science and technology would reveal that it brings us increasingly closer together and makes links between us tighter than ever before. We are increasingly dependent on each other and indispensable to each other.

B.M. DIAH. I recall that this is the idea you set forth in your Vladivostok speech.

M.S. GORBACHEV. I was just going to say that keynoting the Vladivostok speech was our view of the present-day world.

I did not make this point at the outset of our discussion quite deliberately, for I wanted it to serve as a link to what I am going to say next. What I have in mind is that the emergence in the international arena of dozens of states which have taken the road of independent development is one of the realities of this world. It is a vast world that has its own vast interests and huge pending problems.

B.M. DIAH. I am happy to hear directly from you what you said during your official visit to India, at the Moscow Forum *For a Non-Nuclear World, For the Survival of Mankind* and also in your Vladivostok speech.

M.S. GORBACHEV. I think that these points will have to be made over and over again until they get firmly embedded in the minds of politicians and also find their expression in actual policies of states. What I mean is that at present one cannot develop international relations without regard for the interests of all the states. There should be a balance of interests, which alone could lead to a sensible policy. That is the point I wanted to make in the Vladivostok speech.

BM DIAH. It would seem to me that in Vladivostok you taught the world yet another lesson, when you emphasized that, acting alone, the Soviet Union cannot settle all these problems. There is a need for contribution by other Asian states, including China, India, Indonesia and others. I think this is a very accurate and fine point.

MS GORBACHEV. I appreciate very much this assessment of the Vladivostok speech. All we seek is to develop, jointly with all the states in Asia and in the Pacific, a new international relationship consistent with the realities of the contemporary world.

I notice that when listing the states of the region you have not mentioned the United States. And we are looking forward to cooperation with that country too, although we have been hearing from the United States again and again allegations that the Soviet Union is making efforts which pose a threat to the states of the region. But these allegations are absurd. As we said in Vladivostok, we invite all states to cooperate in Asia and the Pacific in the interests of peace and understanding.

In my replies to your questions, I have attempted to dispel any suspicions that may exist in regard to Soviet policy in Asia and the Pacific. We seek to cooperate with the states of the region and in my replies I put forward new concrete proposals in order to substantiate this point and our political statements. In particular, I mentioned a major step which is the elimination of all our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union, provided of course this is done on the basis of a *global zero* with the United States.

I see that my intention to limit myself to a few brief remarks may well grow into a second interview.

BM DIAH. Mr. General Secretary, we are sincerely

happy to have this meeting that for me personally crowns my entire¹ 50-year-long journalistic career.

MS. GORBACHEV. Thank you. I am happy to take part in this coronation ceremony.

BM DIAH. There is one more question that I would like to put to you. Is there any possibility, in the framework of the ideas you expressed in Vladivostok, of your ever coming to Indonesia?

MS. GORBACHEV. We have long-standing relations with Indonesia, marked by their own traditions. Of course, there were ups and downs in our relations. But we cherish our ties with Indonesia. We hope the progress that recently emerged in our relations will continue to gain momentum. This would require contacts, including, of course, political contacts. Apparently, these would become not only possible but also essential. At present, we are looking forward to a visit by the President of Indonesia.

BM DIAH. I am sincerely grateful to you for this meeting and for your replies.

MS. GORBACHEV. Thank you for cooperation and I wish you a fruitful and interesting stay in our country. Good-bye and until we meet again.

* * *

Q. It will soon be one year since you made your Vladivostok speech in which you put forward wide-ranging proposals on the strengthening of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific. Since then many developments have taken place in that vast region. Do you see any positive trends in those developments?

A. I could give you my answer right away—yes, I do.

The year that has passed, its main events, including our talks with India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, have strengthened our belief that raising the questions



Tatiana Musatova

USSR & ANTI-COLONIAL STRUGGLE IN EAST

October ushered in a new, triumphant
stage of national liberation

Tatiana Musatova

USSR & ANTI-COLONIAL STRUGGLE IN EAST



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED
NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS BANGALORE
HYDERABAD AHMEDABAD LUCKNOW

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

Prarthna Flats (1st Floor), Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

15 J.N. Heredia Marg, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400038

3-5-1129 Kachiguda Cross Road, Hyderabad 500027

Patiala House, 16A Ashok Marg, Lucknow 226001

5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700072

13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110002

751, Mount Road, Madras 600002

First Published, 1987

© Tatiana Musatova, 1987

PRINTED IN INDIA

AT ALLIED PUBLISHERS PVT. LTD., A-104, MAYAPURI, PHASE II, NEW DELHI

————CONTENTS————

1	INTRODUCTION
2	SOVIET HELP TO PEOPLES OF THE EAST
9	PASSION FOR LIBERATION
18	DISINTEGRATION OF COLONIAL SYSTEM
24	REMNANTS OF COLONIALISM
43	TOWARDS N-WEAPON-FREE, NON-VIOLENT WORLD
53	AS EQUAL PARTNERS
59	CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Seventy years ago, in 1917, the Great October Socialist Revolution took place in Russia, which led to the formation of the first and biggest socialist power—the Soviet Union. One of the principles of Soviet foreign policy elaborated by V.I. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, was alliance with the national-liberation forces fighting the imperialist policies of diktat and coercion. Over the past seven decades the Soviet Union has been pursuing this policy consistently and persistently and striving to render assistance and support to the struggle the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are waging against colonialism. The present booklet is about the role the Great October Socialist Revolution played in the destinies of the peoples of the East, the emergence of their alliance with the USSR in the anti-colonial struggle, the importance of the unique historical experience of the national-liberation movement amassed by the Asian peoples, and the prospects that are offered by the new political thinking shown by the Soviet Union and a number of other countries.

I. SOVIET HELP TO PEOPLES OF THE EAST

Asia had begun to seethe even before the First World War started and the Great October Socialist Revolution was carried out. V.I. Lenin, and subsequently a number of leaders of the national-liberation movement, Jawaharlal Nehru included, linked the "awakening of Asia" in the early 20th century with the international repercussions of the first Russian revolution of 1905. "There can be no doubt," Lenin wrote in 1908, "that the age-old plunder of India by the British, and the contemporary struggle of all these 'advanced' Europeans against Persian and Indian democracy will steel millions, tens of millions of proletarians in Asia to wage a struggle against their oppressors which will be...victorious..."¹

To get a fuller idea of such a truly international event as the "awakening of Asia", let us recall that by the start of the First World War colonies had covered 56 per cent of the globe's territory and accounted for 31.5 per cent of the world population. Semi-colonies included, these figures stood at 72 per cent and 69 per cent respectively. In Asia there were vast parts of the largest colonial empires, the British Empire first and foremost. The largest colonial domains—India, Indonesia and

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, pp. 184-185, Russian ed.

Indochina—were located here, as was China, the largest semi-colony and the country with the largest population.

Mass actions were gaining momentum in every Asian country, which were developing into uprisings against local and colonial authorities and western imperialism. The appearance of such political figures as Sun Yat-sen and M.K. Gandhi, who graphically illustrated the aspiration of their peoples for liberation from foreign oppression, was eloquent proof of the growing national-liberation struggle and its influence on revolutionary developments in the world.

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia was a powerful catalyst to the national-liberation movement, ushering in its new, triumphant stage. By wresting from the ranks of the imperialist powers a huge country stretching in Europe and Asia and by opening the road to a just society for the Russian working people, the Great October Socialist Revolution brought hope for the oppressed nations of the East as well. From that moment they had in the person of the Russian working people a bulwark of anti-imperialist struggle.

From the outset Soviet Russia came out in defence of the freedom and independence of all nations, large and small alike. A deep response was evoked in the minds and hearts of the eastern peoples by the first foreign policy acts of Soviet government, namely, the Decree on Peace, the Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People, and the Declaration of the Rights of the Nations of Russia. The proclamation in them of the policy of peace and of the right of the peoples to self-determination was truly revolutionary. The masses in the East had for centuries borne the yoke of colonialism and racism. They had come to know from their own experience that the right to self-determination and independence is the first of the fundamental rights

of peoples, from which all basic rights—political, economic, social and cultural—obtain. Self-determination spells an end to colonialism. What impressed them about the Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People was the condemnation of the barbarous policy of western civilisation, which built the well-being of the exploiters in a few select nations on the enslavement of hundreds of millions of the working population in Asia, in the colonies in general, and in small countries.

The peoples of the East received with particular gratitude the Appeal of the Soviet of People's Commissars of the Russian Federation "To All Working Moslems of Russia and the East", which Lenin signed in December 1917. It proclaimed the Soviet government's abandonment of the predatory policy of the czarist government vis-a-vis the peoples of the East and the surrender of all privileges which Russia had on the basis of secret treaties concluded with the imperialist powers regarding Asian countries.

The new foreign policy principles proclaimed by Soviet Russia were permeated with Leninist ideas on the natural alliance of the world proletariat and the national-liberation movement in the fight against world imperialism. This alliance was the only one, inasmuch as it was based on an objective community of interests of the two forces in the struggle against a common enemy. Without victory over imperialism, the elimination of colonial oppression it spawned was unthinkable.

As Lenin sagaciously observed, the new historical epoch which was ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution "will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries,

of all dependent countries, against international imperialism."¹

The veracity of this idea of Lenin's has been borne out by the historical record of the national-liberation struggle. In his message to the international conference "The Great October Socialist Revolution in the Destinies of the Eastern People", held on the initiative of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation in Damascus in April 1987, Syrian President Hafiz al-Assad stressed that from the outset Lenin assessed the importance of a militant alliance between the October Revolution and the working masses of the eastern nations. The ideas of the October Revolution are the basis of the fight of these peoples against imperialism and its allies today, too.

The political map of the world has undergone great transformations in our day. Dozens of young states have appeared where there once were huge colonial empires. These countries have turned from objects of colonial exploitation into fullfledged participants in international relations. However, their struggle against imperialism does not end with the attainment of political independence. The developing states are very different. They include those which are oriented to the development of socialist society. Others are following the capitalist path. But all of them are united by a number of common features and interests, namely the need to surmount the onerous legacy of the colonial past, achieve economic self-sufficiency, and counter neocolonialist policy.

Through political manoeuvres, promises, bribery, military threats and blackmail, and frequently direct interference in the internal affairs of emergent countries, western countries have been largely successful in

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 30, p. 159, Russian ed.

salvaging the relations of economic dependence that had taken shape earlier. On this basis the imperialists were able to create and adjust the most sophisticated system of neocolonial exploitation and tether a large number of emergent countries more tightly to themselves.

The struggle for economic independence, for a restructuring of international economic relations on a just, democratic basis is perhaps no less tense than the fight for political independence. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are dependable allies of the young states in this struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism.

Not only the ideas of the revolution but also the first steps Soviet Russia took to consolidate the internationalist alliance with the struggle of the peoples of the East are highly topical in our day.

Soviet Russia extended immediately a fraternal hand in assisting the Asian freedom fighters. During the extremely grim years of civil war and imperialist intervention it lent economic and military support to the national-liberation forces of Turkey and Iran in their fight against British intervention and occupation. Assistance was also provided to the Afghan people, who had won independence in 1919 and were immediately faced with the threat of British intervention. Drawing on Soviet assistance, the Turkish, Iranian and Afghan patriots were successful in forcing the occupiers and interventionists to leave; they upheld their countries' independence.

In 1921 Soviet Russia signed the first treaties of friendship with Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan. These treaties enabled these countries to fortify their sovereignty and establish themselves in the international arena as independent states. The importance of the signed documents is not confined to this, however. The

treaties of 1921 were the first proof of the emergence of a new type of international relations—genuinely equitable relations between nations. They were implemented on the basis of complete equality, without one side dictating its writ to the other, without attempts at obtaining unilateral advantages and privileges.

It is these principles that have underscored the relations between the Soviet Union and the emergent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the seven decades the Soviet state has been in existence. In those distant 1920s, however, the proclamation of such principles was a political innovation, and it generated broad-based international repercussions. Citing the humane and just policies which Soviet Russia was pursuing towards them, the Asian countries now had weighty arguments to demand that the imperialist states treat them as equals.

Assessing Soviet policy vis-a-vis contiguous Asian countries, Jawaharlal Nehru called this policy "extremely magnanimous", "generous" and "wise". On Russia's part this was also a policy of common sense, which gave it "many friends in the East", including "non-communist" countries.¹

Calling themselves western civilisers, the colonisers had plundered and humiliated the Asian peoples for centuries. Now the Asian peoples were making a comparison in favour of Soviet Russia, whose policies and actions were facilitating their road to freedom. "Praise and glory to the Russian people, which is spearheading the movement against the world of oppression!" said Kemal Ataturk, the leader of the Turkish revolution.

Standing between capitalist Europe and colonial Asia, Soviet Russia by and large exerted an enormous

1. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glances of World History*, 1949, p. 690

revolutionising influence on neighbouring countries. In the 20s a wave of mass action and uprisings had engulfed the entire Asian continent. In 1921 a popular revolution had triumphed in Mongolia. The conflagration was clearly spreading over to China, where a revolution took place from 1925 to 1927. From China it continued to Indochina and on to Indonesia; from Turkey to Syria; from Iran to Iraq. The movement for independence in India that had already gained momentum intensified markedly in the 30s. The crisis of imperialism's colonial system had begun.

II. PASSION FOR LIBERATION

The victory over nazi Germany and militarist Japan that was won by the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, with the decisive contribution being made by the Soviet Union, hastened the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, which concluded in its downfall. The consolidation of the USSR's international positions made for a change in the international correlation of forces on the planet in favour of socialism, peace and democracy. Qualitatively new conditions for the peoples' anticolonial struggle appeared.

The United Nations Organisation was formed in 1945; its purpose was to ensure international peace and security. The principle of the self-determination of peoples, the equality of large and small nations, and equality of rights of all people irrespective of race, language or religion was enshrined in the UN Charter at the initiative of the USSR. The trusteeship system was instituted under UN auspices. At the insistence of the USSR and other progressive countries, the preparation of the population of trust territories "in the direction of self-government or independence" was regarded as one of the main tasks of the trusteeship system. A special section of the Charter was devoted to the colonial-dependent territories. The administering authorities were now supposed to hand over to the UN

information on the state of affairs on these territories. In this way the times of illegal colonial brigandage passed, the UN having legitimate grounds for engaging in questions of colonialism and supporting the national-liberation struggle.

Asian countries were in the forefront of the offensive on colonialism. Why did the anti-colonial outcome of the Second World War have an effect primarily on the Asian continent? First and foremost, the Asian peoples had an opportunity to draw on assistance from the Soviet Union, whose armed forces had routed the Kwantung army of Japan. It is telling that Asian countries assessed highly the contribution of the USSR to the defeat of the common enemy. This fact is evidenced by the following statement by Aung San, a national hero of Burma: "We are inspired by the bravery and heroic spirit of the Soviet people, who rose to rout the fascist bands in the Second World War," he said. "We are also proud of the fact that that great socialist country is fighting for the rights of backward and enslaved peoples."

Asian countries contributed to the triumph of the anti-Hitler coalition. Asian soldiers fought against the nazi hordes on the fronts in Europe and North Africa, and the public at large was involved in hostilities in Asia. The fight against fascism was for freedom-loving people a fight against the most reactionary forces of imperialism and racism; in their minds it was bound up with the struggle for their national rights, and it ultimately became that.

It cannot be forgotten that the most economically and politically developed colonies were located in Asia. India, Burma, Indochina and Indonesia were all countries with ancient civilisations that in their time had exerted a great influence on the formation of European culture.

The year 1945 when the Second World War ended, when nazi Germany and its allies in Europe were routed and militarist Japan vanquished, can rightly be called the year of Asia as well. It was in this period that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam attained independence and the peoples of Laos and Cambodia rose up in armed struggle. In August 1945 the Soviet Army liberated Korea from Japanese oppression, and three years later the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was proclaimed in North Korea. August 1945 saw the eruption of the Indonesian revolution, which resulted in the proclamation of the Republic of Indonesia.

In 1946 the Philippines became independent. The revolutionary struggle was gaining momentum in India, forcing the British imperialists to retreat. India's independence was proclaimed on August 15, 1947.

The USSR came out decisively in support of India in the UN in 1946, when western countries attempted to thwart a decision on its being granted independence.

This year the whole of progressive humanity is celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 40th anniversary of India's independence. Its proclamation, as Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi put it, "sounded as a death knell of 'classical' colonialism all over the planet".¹

The USSR was one of the first to recognise India as a sovereign independent country and stated its readiness to establish diplomatic relations with it. The USSR and India celebrated the 40th anniversary of this event in 1987.

The independence of Burma and Ceylon was proclaimed in December 1948.

The triumph of the popular revolution in China was an event of historic importance. The positions of the

1. *Dialogue Between Trusted Friends*, New Delhi, 1986, p. 20.

People's Liberation Army of China were considerably reinforced with the liberation of Manchuria by the Soviet Army. The People's Republic of China was proclaimed on October 1, 1949.

On the whole, the national-liberation revolutions which swept the Asian continent led to the formation of national statehood in 14 Asian countries. Hundreds of millions of people were liberated from colonial slavery over some 15 years.

Independence did not come of its own accord to the Asian countries; it was won by the peoples in a fierce struggle against the colonisers, who never voluntarily gave up their positions anywhere. France, Great Britain, Holland and Portugal with US support strove with force of arms to hold on to or restore their domination over the colonies.

The situation in Asia was complicated by the sharp aggravation of tensions in the world resulting from the transition of the Western countries from a direct confrontation to a policy of "cold war" against the USSR, their former ally in the anti-Hitler coalition, and of taking recourse to encircling the Soviet Union by hostile military-political blocs. They stubbornly tried to involve the Asian countries in these blocs, e.g., the Bagdad Pact and SEATO, and thus make them a part of their anti-Soviet policies. The Asian peoples and their friends and brothers on other continents remember the dark days of the bloody wars the imperialists unleashed in Korea and Vietnam and the colonialist intervention against the young Republic of Indonesia. The names of the heroes who gave their lives for their countries' freedom and independence will never be forgotten.

The Soviet Union was on the side of the victims of imperialist aggression. Soviet representatives in the UN and at other international forums relentlessly exposed imperialist arbitrariness and upheld the right of the

peoples of the Republic of Indonesia, Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia to independence, to independent development of their own choice in the context of peace and security.

With its actions in the UN Security Council the Soviet Union backed the liberation of the Portuguese colonies of Goa, Daman and Diu and the transfer of these age-old Indian territories to India.

Through its actions in the UN and in the international arena the USSR furthered the elimination of the colonial regime in West Irian and its reunification with the Republic of Indonesia.

There is not a single country on the Asian continent, with whose struggle for national rights the peoples of the Soviet Union was not in solidarity. And this solidarity was expressed in more than political and diplomatic plans. The Asian countries know fully well that it was the Soviet Union which provided substantial material and military assistance to countries which needed it to rebuff imperialist aggression and safeguard the gains of national-liberation revolutions. Many statesmen and political figures expressed their gratitude to the Soviet Union for its assistance and continue to do so. During a visit to the Soviet Union in 1984 Kim Il Sung, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Worker's Party of Korea, said: "The Soviet people shed their blood to help our people in their fight to revive their country; they rendered us moral support and material assistance during the national-liberation war against the aggression of the American imperialists. . . ." Later, too, in peacetime, the USSR continues to render assistance to the DPRK, which is building a new life. The Korean people "always remember this and are grateful for it".

When it became clear that the victory of the forces of national liberation was irrevocable and that the new

correlation of forces in the world in favour of socialism was making the restoration of colonial domination impossible, the imperialist countries switched to a policy of neocolonialism. It is the same colonialist policy, but in more sophisticated, veiled forms that are endlessly being adapted to the changing conditions in the present-day world. The aim of the neocolonialists is to halt the national-liberation movement, emasculate the sovereignty won by the young states, preserve and even intensify control of them, draw these states into the orbit of militarism, and use them as bridgeheads for their aggressive policies. In working towards these goals the imperialists employ military pressure and economic diktat, support internal reaction, and carry out ideological subversion.

It is already clear that the "generous" aid and the "legitimate" terms of the neocolonialist loans of the postwar decades have been translated into debt servitude for the peoples. Neocolonialism has facilitated expansion in the emergent countries for the transnational corporations (TNCs), whose activity undermines the national sovereignty of these countries.

However, most Asian countries in their first years of independence have made the right choice, namely, not to let themselves be led by the neocolonisers, who are drawing them into blocs in order to involve them in anti-Soviet policies, but to shape their own independent foreign policy course, which is geared to consolidating independence and to development in conditions of peace. India played a special role in making this choice. In a number of his speeches during the first years of independence Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru stressed that India would pursue its own policy as a free country, and not as a satellite of another. He also stated that India "...wants to keep

aloof from the big blocs of nations and be friendly to all countries".¹

Friendship between the Soviet Union and India was established at the very outset of the latter's independent development, and this friendship is growing in our day. In this fashion the idea of non-alignment was first formulated and elevated into a principle of foreign policy. Nehru linked the basic ideas of non-alignment directly with vigorous peace efforts, independence, and international cooperation.

The foreign policy principles of the emergent Asian countries were further developed in the relations between the continent's two biggest countries—China and India. Through the efforts of both sides the five principles of *Panchsheel*, peaceful coexistence, were found: mutual respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty; nonaggression, noninterference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

The adoption of the *Panchsheel* principles by India and China and later by Burma was instrumental to the formation of peaceful, good-neighbourly relations between states not only in Asia but in the rest of the world as well. These principles were given a high assessment by the Soviet Union.

These five principles of peaceful coexistence underlay the decisions of the Bandung conference of 29 Afro-Asian countries held in April 1955. The participants in this forum condemned colonialism, racial segregation and discrimination, and called for economic and cultural cooperation among countries.

The conference drafted the ten principles of Bandung to supplement the *Panchsheel* principles. They are: (1)

1. Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, Selected Speeches, September 1946-April 1961, New Delhi, 1983, p. 37.

respect for fundamental human rights, as well as, the goals and principles of the UN Charter; (2) respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries; (3) recognition of the equality of all races and the equality of all nations, large and small; (4) nonintervention and noninterference in the internal affairs of another country; (5) respect of the right of each country to individual and collective defence in accordance with the UN Charter; (6) (a) nonuse of collective defence agreements in the interests of any of the great powers; (b) nonuse of pressure by one country against another; (7) abstention from actions or the threat of aggression or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country; (8) settlement of all international disputes through peaceful means at the choice of sides in accordance with the UN Charter; (9) promotion of mutual interests and cooperation; and (10) respect for justice and international commitments.

The Bandung decisions indicated the way to building international relations on a new, just basis. They mirror the objective trend toward unity among the peace and freedom-loving forces coming out against all types of national oppression and imperialist aggression, for independence, peace and international security.

The *Panchsheel* and Bandung principles are relevant today also. They can be one of the foundations of an all-Asian security system, something the Soviet Union has been calling for.

The Bandung principles underlay the non-aligned movement which emerged in 1961, uniting different countries on every continent in their protest against the bloc policy, colonialism, racism and neocolonialism and in their appeal for peaceful coexistence. Today the movement has in its ranks over 100 states of Asia,

Africa, Latin America, Europe and Oceania with an aggregate population of over two billion

The Soviet Union supports the goals and activity of the non-aligned movement and is in favour of its playing a greater role in world politics. The USSR applauds the non-aligned movement's positive role in the struggle for peace and the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, for disarmament and an easing of international tensions, against imperialism, colonialism, racism and also any forms of aggression, interference, domination and hegemony in the political and economic spheres, and for the creation of a new economic order.

The new edition of the Programme of the CPSU adopted in February 1986 at its 27th congress states that "the Soviet Union is building its relations (with the emergent countries) on the basis of strict respect for their independence and equality. . Cooperation between these countries and the socialist states is of great importance for consolidating the independence of the peoples, improving international relations, and preserving peace." The provisions of this Programme are a direct upshot of the policy bequeathed by Lenin, that became a reality as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Asia, which has awakened to the new life in the 20th century, has enriched world progress with diverse and original experience of struggle for freedom. This is more than history; it is a living heritage, which comprises one of the important foundations of today's political realities in this part of the world.

III. DISINTEGRATION OF COLONIAL SYSTEM

From Asia the flames of the anticolonial struggle spread to Africa and Latin America. A giant wave of popular indignation and a burning desire to restore justice swept over the colonial empires. The year 1960, when as many as 17 African states won independence, rightly went down in history as the *Year of Africa*.

The unprecedented upsurge of the national-liberation movement in the late 50s-early 60s became possible owing to the growing power of the socialist countries, whose economic, political and military might forced the imperialists in many countries to scrap power politics vis-a-vis the struggling peoples.

The non-aligned movement was formed and it vigorously opposed colonialism. The Afro-Asian solidarity movement strengthened. In 1963 the Organisation of African Unity, which united the continent's independent states and declared its adherence to the policy of non-alignment, was formed. There began what Lenin had predicted would be "a period in which all the Eastern peoples (would) participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world..."

The struggling peoples now acquired a possibility to

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 30, p. 160, Russian ed.

draw not only on more effective assistance from the socialist states, but also on support from countries that had liberated themselves from colonialism. Typically, the constitutions of the independent Asian states note the task of fighting against colonialism as a foreign policy goal.

The progressive changes in the world were mirrored in the alignment of forces in the UN. As a result of Afro-Asian countries having been admitted to it, the "mechanical majority" of the western powers was eliminated, the scales shifting in favour of supporters of the eradication of colonialism, and conditions being created in which anticolonial decisions could be taken by the UN.

The Soviet government proceeded from the belief that the United Nations cannot remain on the sidelines of this paramount movement of modern times, that the demand for the complete elimination of the colonial system is timely and will win understanding and support on the part of most Asian, African and Latin American states.

At the USSR's initiative and in accordance with a draft by Afro-Asian countries, the 15th session of the UN General Assembly adopted in 1960 the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The resolution was passed by 90 votes. No one voted against. Only nine countries, including the United States, Great Britain, France and Portugal, abstained, thereby demonstrating their desire to keep the moribund colonial system intact.

In the message of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to the participants in the special jubilee session of the UN General Assembly on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, this

document is called "an international anticolonial manifesto". The declaration resolutely condemns colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, proclaims the need to immediately put an end to colonial slavery, and confirms the peoples's right to self-determination and independence and the legitimacy of their fight to exercise this right.

The declaration states that insufficient development in the political, economic and other spheres should not be a pretext for delay in granting independence. It also points out that any attempt at partially or fully destroying a country's national unity and territorial integrity is incompatible with the goals and principles of the UN Charter.

The Soviet Union is particularly gratified that the ideas of equality of states and peoples proclaimed by the Great October Socialist Revolution materialised in the declaration. The adoption of this document gave the national-liberation movements a clear-cut goal—the complete elimination of the colonial system. A massive, final offensive against the colonial order was launched.

This offensive has been in progress for over a quarter of a century now. As the resolutions of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly point out, impressive successes have been scored over this period. Indeed, the imperialist colonial system had in effect been uprooted worldwide by the end of the 70s. Over the 25 years that have passed since the declaration was passed, some 60 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania, with an aggregate population running into the tens of millions, have been liberated from colonial slavery.¹

The triumphs of the national-liberation movement have been particularly long in coming, however.

1. *Document UN, A/C. A/41/SR. 5*, October 3, 1986, p. 2.

Western countries have been hampering the declaration's implementation. In a number of instances this involved colonial wars, interventions and repressions against national-liberation forces. This was the case in Algeria, the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). This is how things stand in Namibia even today. The same thing is happening in South Africa, where the criminal apartheid regime is subjecting the African population to racial exploitation. *

Broadbased mobilisation of all progressives and their struggle against imperialism was required to make the declaration's implementation a success.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries were on the side of the peoples in their struggle in those years as well. As African expert A. Davidson writes, "admiration of Africa, its struggle and its victories were typical of Soviet people beginning in the 60s. . . . Virtually every second building in Moscow had a poster of an African on it. With his appearance—he was depicted tearing apart chains with his powerful muscles—he symbolised love of freedom".¹

Solidarity was manifest in the political, diplomatic and military spheres.

In 1961 socialist and emergent countries took an active part in the UN in setting up a Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Thanks to the effort of these countries, which comprised two-thirds of the committee's memberships, this body became an effective decolonisation headquarters. During the special jubilee session of the General Assembly on the

1 Moscow News, May 17, 1987.

occasion of the 25th anniversary of the declaration of 1960, the representatives of many states, Asian ones included, praised the role the committee was playing in accomplishing the declaration's goals, stressing that many countries had won independence thanks to the committee's vigorous support.¹

Western authors, American researcher Harold K. Jacobson among them, believe that in the 60s the USSR was the UN's most decisive critic of the colonial system and that the Soviet Union's stand exerted a great impact on the actions of the anticolonial forces.

The 70s witnessed a fresh upsurge in the national-liberation movement. This was due to the continued growth of the socialist world's might and the breakthrough made in international relations towards detente. Cooperation between the socialist countries and the emergent ones, the non-aligned states in particular, had deepened. The UN was an important arena for this cooperation. As a result of joint efforts by progressive countries, a number of decisions were adopted in the UN that confirmed and developed the anticolonial provisions of the 1960 declaration. These were the appeal to the United Nations and to all UN member states to lend moral and material support to the national-liberation movements; to promote the immediate and full conclusion of the decolonisation process by terminating the activity of the imperialist monopolies that were impeding this process and by ceasing all military activity and dismantling military bases on colonial territories. It was only the western countries, the US and Great Britain in particular, that failed to support the anti-imperialist provisions of UN decisions on decolonisation, and fail to do so even today.

1. *Document UN, A/40/PV*. October 16, 1985, pp. 3-5.

Socialist countries did a great deal for the triumph of the national-liberation forces in Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Angola and Mozambique. Prominent statesmen and public figures in these countries have repeatedly expressed the gratitude of the peoples of their countries for Soviet aid.

About half of the countries that have won their independence over the past quarter of a century comprise territories situated in Asia and in the adjacent areas of the Pacific and Indian oceans. Kuwait, Western Samoa, Singapore, Aden (the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen), Mauritius, the Maldives and Nauru became independent in the 60s. Bahrain, Tonga, Fiji, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, the Comores, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu, the Seychelles, the Solomon Islands and Kiribati attained liberation in the 70s. The 80s have witnessed the decolonisation of three more territories—Vanuatu, Brunei and the Cocos Islands (now a part of Australia)—a solid addition to the ranks of the young states.

Following its traditional policy born of the October Revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union was one of the first to recognise the emergent countries as sovereign and independent states and to voice a readiness to establish diplomatic relations with them. At present the USSR maintains diplomatic relations with most of the above countries. The report on the official visit of Papua New Guinean Prime Minister Kiki to the USSR in 1976 stated that the establishment of diplomatic relations favours bilateral cooperation based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit.

IV. REMNANTS OF COLONIALISM

No matter how impressive the successes scored in implementing the declaration on decolonisation may be, colonialism has not yet been fully eliminated. Vestiges of colonial regimes continue to poison life on the planet, posing as they do a serious threat to international peace and security. Concern was voiced over this fact in a resolution of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly. This concern was fully shared by the Soviet Union, which was mentioned in the message of Mikhail Gorbachev to the participants in the special jubilee session of the General Assembly in connection with the declaration's 25th anniversary, marked in 1985.

The impressive successes scored in implementing the declaration emphasize the fact that today there are still about two dozen colonial territories with an aggregate population of over 5.5 million in the world. The largest colony among them is Namibia, with a population of some 1.5 million.

When the USA embarked upon the path of confrontation with the Soviet Union in the 80s, it initiated a broadbased offensive against the gains of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. The policy of neoglobalism, i.e., imperialist domination, is aimed not only against the socialist countries, but above all against the young states and national-liberation

movements. Washington assigns an important role in the counteroffensive on the forces of national liberation to military means, right down to using its own armed forces as was the case in Grenada. A special interventionist Rapid Deployment Force was formed. A "central command" (CENTCOM) was set up to supervise the force's operations. Washington arrogated to itself the right to declare entire regions of the world far from US shores as "spheres of American vital interests" and to take pre-emptive and punitive military actions in the event a threat to these interests supposedly arises.

The Rapid Deployment Force is designed precisely for military operations on the territories of other countries; it can be deployed on the territories of states "friendly" to the US without the consent of their governments if Washington feels that a threat to American interests has arisen there. The US is thus arrogating to itself the right to resort to actions to undermine the socio-political system of other states, in other words, to military interventions.

Washington is crudely distorting the essence of the national-liberation movement, calling it "international terrorism". It is thus attempting to justify its criminal actions against Asian, African and Latin American patriots and defile the memory of many freedom fighters who fell heroically in the fight for their peoples' happiness.

It is evident, however, that it is the United States that has elevated state-sponsored terrorism to the status of its policy. Washington does not go by the norms of international law, or with the sovereignty of the young states or their vital interests.

The imperial behaviour of US in recent years vis-a-vis many young states, such as Grenada, Lebanon, Nicaragua and Libya and the undeclared war against



Tatiana Leonidovna Musatova is a specialist in international affairs. She is the author of a number of publications on colonialism and neocolonialism, including the monograph *The USSR in the UN: In the Struggle For Peace, Security and Cooperation, 1945-85* and the two-volume collection of documents entitled *The USSR in the Struggle Against Colonialism and Neocolonialism, 1960-86*. She has written a number of books on French neocolonialism in Africa. A number of her articles on the history of Russia's ties with North African countries, based on new archive materials, have been published in Soviet periodicals.



Grigory Bondarevsky

STRUGGLE FOR ASIAN UNITY & SECURITY

1947 Asian forum marked a new
era in international relations

Grigory Bondarevsky

**STRUGGLE FOR
ASIAN UNITY
& SECURITY**

Grigory Bondarevsky

STRUGGLE FOR ASIAN UNITY & SECURITY

**On the 40th Anniversary of the
Asian Relations Conference in Delhi**



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

**NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS BANGALORE
HYDERABAD AHMEDABAD LUCKNOW**

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

Prarthna Flats (1st Floor), Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

15 J.N. Heredia Marg, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400038

3-5-1129 Kachiguda Cross Road, Hyderabad 500027

Patiala House, 16A Ashok Marg, Lucknow 226001

5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700072

13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110002

751, Mount Road, Madras 600002

First Published, 1987

© Grigory Bondarevsky, 1987

Publisher's Note

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Asian Relations Conference in Delhi, the first meeting of Asian nations to collectively devise ways and means to break the shackles of colonialism and assert their own independent identity. Notwithstanding the divergences of social orders, culture, economic positions and level of democratic movements, and above all the intrigues of imperialism, the Asian Relations Conference was an outstanding event in the life of Asian peoples. Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of modern India, was its prime mover. It was the continuation, as author of this booklet Grigory Bondarevsky says, of the "integral line" of the great Indian national uprising of 1857-59 which is still being pursued in different forms against imperialist attempts at imposing neoglobalism. Prof. Bondarevsky, a wellknown Soviet historian, in this booklet not only very clearly analyses this "awakening of Asia" but also throws light on some hitherto unknown aspects of the Delhi conference. He also shows the linkage the aspirations of Asian peoples have with the 1986 Delhi Declaration of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. On October 2, 1987 a

commemorative session in Delhi was opened to mark the 40th anniversary of the Asian Relations Conference. The Publishers deemed it fit to bring out this booklet to coincide with that occasion as a tribute to the striving of the peoples of Asia for their consolidation for freedom and emancipation. They are also very happy to include in this booklet some rare photographs of the Asian Relations Conference which have been very kindly provided by the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

Foreword

In March 1947, I had the honour of leading a delegation from Soviet Uzbekistan to the first Asian Relations Conference in Delhi. At the conference the USSR was represented also by delegations from the other Union Republics of Central Asia, Kazakhstan and Transcaucasia.

The Delhi conference was instrumental in consolidating an understanding among the countries and peoples of Asia. It was during this conference that I had a meeting with the great son of the Indian people, Jawaharlal Nehru, who played a key role in organising this international meet.

We had arrived in Delhi at a time when the country was still under British rule. The colonisers' position was shaky, however. India had been swept by a wave of a popular movement under the slogan "Quit India" which had been advanced by Mahatma Gandhi. He had given a call for non-violent civil disobedience.

The movement had been suppressed and the leaders of the Indian National Congress (INC) were imprisoned. Over 60,000 had been arrested. Jawaharlal Nehru was among them. But the British could not cow down the Indian people.

In 1946 British rule had been struck another heavy blow, this time by a revolt of the "Royal Indian Navy" in

Bombay, followed by Karachi, Visakhapatnam and several other places. The crews of 60 ships took part in the uprising.

Britain had realised that under the circumstances it had no other way but to relinquish its colonial power. But how could this be done "with dignity", with as much of its former influence in India being preserved as possible?

The mighty process of the liberation of the Asian and African colonies, which changed the face of the globe after the Second World War and the Soviet people's victory in it, had already begun. The British had hoped that they would keep intact their interests in India through the INC. At the same time they had been seeking to divide and weaken the would be independent country. They had been encouraging the Muslim League and pressing it to stick to the demand for a division of the country into India and Pakistan.

In August 1946 the Muslim League had begun a "day of direct actions" in its fight for Pakistan. Manifestations in Calcutta developed into a clash with Hindus. Over 3,000 people were killed. The insanity spilled over to other regions as well.

The tragedy over the partition had largely influenced the fact that unfriendly relations, which accorded with the interests of imperialism, had immediately been established between India and Pakistan.

It is with good reason that I have recalled in such detail the developments in India that preceded Asian Relations Conference in Delhi whose initiator and organiser was Jawaharlal Nehru. In his address he called the conference the first step towards cooperation among the Asian peoples. He called for unity and solidarity and stressed that the conference was of great importance not only for the West but for the East as well in strengthening peace and good-neighbourliness.

The conference opened on March 23, 1947. It was presided over by the prominent Indian public figure, Sarojini Naidu. Speeches of greetings were delivered by the representatives of Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, China and Burma. Various conference sections, namely, "the national question", "demographic problems", "the economy", "culture", and "women's issues", were constituted at the plenary session. In the culture section, for example, the view was expressed that an exchange of cultural achievements among the Asian countries was expedient. I can recall the address of the famous Indian physicist, Prof. C.V. Raman, who spoke of linguistic problems in India and criticised the educational system in the country. Many preferred studying in Britain, he pointed out.

The participants discussed ways and means of solving the problems facing the Asian countries—poverty and hunger, economic backwardness, and illiteracy. For this reason the development experience in the Central Asian Republics was of particular interest to the delegates. Nehru invariably adduced as an example the Soviet Central Asian Republics, which had made such rapid advances within the lifetime of a single generation and which has a great deal to teach others. "Soviet Russia", Nehru wrote in his *An Autobiography*, "had triumphed over enormous difficulties. . . While the rest of the world was in the grip of the depression and going backward in some ways, in the Soviet country a great new world was being built up before our eyes. . . I was impressed by the reports of the great progress made by the backward regions of Central Asia under the Soviet regime. In the balance, therefore, I was all in favour of Russia, and the presence and example of the Soviets was a bright and heartening phenomenon in a dark and dismal world."

After the conference the Soviet delegation was provided an opportunity to visit many Indian cities—Agra,

Allahabad, Calcutta, Madras, Hyderabad and Bombay. We could see for ourselves the contrast of poverty and wealth in India. In keeping with the spirit of the conference, we exchanged our experience and knowledge. In Delhi, for instance, the Georgian scientist, Viktor Ku-pradze and I delivered several lectures on mathematics. Wherever we later went we invariably visited universities, delivered papers and reports, and even made a scientific discovery.

At that time I was engaged in synoptic meteorology. While I was in Bombay and Madras, I observed a characteristic feature. It is believed that the weather is "made" in the north, but the north had almost no influence on the climate in Bombay and southern India. These regions "make" their own weather. When I returned home to Tashkent I expressed my ideas to my colleagues, professors Viktor Bugayev and Viktor Dis-ordzhno. After proper research we wrote a joint article entitled "the formation of weather in central and anterior Asia", which was published in the journal *Paper of the USSR Academy of Sciences* in 1947. We carried out future research into the phenomenon and were awarded the state prize of the USSR. I am not a politician, but as a scientist I have seen for myself the broad horizons that open up before science and other spheres for that matter if the peoples aspire to peace, good-neighbourliness and mutual understanding. The extensive ties between the USSR and India exemplify these relations. The first practical step towards this coalescence was taken at the Delhi conference 40 years ago.

The brochure by prominent Soviet orientalist Grigory Bondarevsky is a detailed and extensive study of the history behind this conference and its role in the effort for unity and security in Asia.

T.A. Sarymsakov

STRUGGLE FOR ASIAN UNITY AND SECURITY

The opening session of the first conference on inter-Asian relations in history, which opened on March 23, 1947 in the Purana Qila (old fortress) in Delhi, was attended by 10,000 people including 244 delegates and observers. It was a milestone in the struggle of progressive forces of Asia against colonialism, for unity and security. It exerted a powerful influence on the development of the liberation movement of the Asian peoples, on their fight against colonialism in all its manifestations, and on the formation of the ideas of unity and security problems. Other milestones of these developments were the Bandung Conference of 1955, conferences of heads of state and government of the non-aligned countries and, lastly, the historic Delhi Declaration of 1986.

The aspiration of progressive leaders of Asia to pool their efforts in the struggle for independence was manifest back in the latter half of the 19th century, when mighty liberation movements, such as the Taiping uprising in China and the great popular uprising in India of 1857-59, showed the whole world the power and might of the colonial and semicolonial peoples and their striving for independent development. The young Indian intelligentsia was closely following the uprising led by Zaghul Pasha against the puppets of the British colo-

The National Archives of India has two telegrams sent by Edwin S. Montagu, British Secretary of State for Indian Affairs, to Lord Chelmsford, Viceroy of India, in which he was instructed to do everything in his power to prevent this Appeal from being circulated in India. In July 1919 an "Appeal of the Government of the Russian Federation to the Chinese People and the governments of South and North China" was issued. It said that in their struggle for independence the Chinese people could readily count on the support of the working people of Russia.

In spring 1920 the Indian Revolutionary Association was formed in Kabul, its main goal being to prepare for the fight to liberate India. It sent a warm message of greetings to Lenin, and on May 20 the reply by the founder of the Communist Party and Soviet state was printed in *Pravda* and broadcast on radio. It read in part: "The working masses of Russia are following with unflagging attention the awakening of the Indian workers and peasants. . . We welcome the close alliance of Moslems and non-Moslem elements. We sincerely want to see this alliance extended to all the toilers of the East. . . . Long live Free Asia!"

In September 1920, Baku, the capital of Soviet Azerbaijan, which had just been liberated from the oppression of foreign invaders, hosted the First Congress of the Nations of the East, which was attended by 2,050 people—delegates from most Asian countries, including representatives from India, Afghanistan, Iran, Japan, Korea, Palestine, Turkey, and the Soviet Eastern republics. The Indian delegation consisted of 14 persons. One of the speakers in Baku was that outstanding fighter against imperialism, noted American publicist John Reed, author of the famous book about the October Revolution *Ten Days That Shook the World*, which has been translated into dozens of languages including

many languages of India. In his speech Reed unmasked American imperialism and caustically ridiculed the hypocritical words of the West about "selfless assistance". He called upon the peoples of the East to be vigilant as regards the intrigues of American "friends" and "liberators".

The congress manifesto "To the Nations of the East" read: "We are calling you to a holy war for your own benefit, for your freedom, for your lives!" Farther on it contained an appeal for a holy war "for the liberation of the nations of the East, for the destruction of the division of humanity into oppressing nations and oppressed nations, for the complete equalisation of all nations and tribes, no matter what language they may speak, no matter what skin colour they may have, no matter what religion they may profess. To a holy war for the destruction of the division of countries into advanced and backward, dépendent and independent, mother countries and colonial countries."

The document exposed the racist policy of the British colonisers in India, the Arab East, Persia and China. The section dealing with British policy in India read: "The Indian peasant has to give away to the British government such a part of his harvest that he cannot feed himself even a few months with the remaining portion. The Indian worker must work at the factories of British capitalists for such pathetic pennies that he cannot even buy himself the daily handful of rice he needs for subsistence. Every year millions of Indians die of hunger, millions perish in jungles and swamps at rigorous ventures undertaken by the British capitalists for their enrichment."

The documents of the Soviet government and the materials of the First Congress of the Nations of the East in Baku made a great impression on the progressive personalities of many Asian countries, above all

that of India with its mounting protest movement against the attempts of the victors in the First World War to expand their domination over the Eastern peoples. This was mirrored in the well-known *Khilafat* movement, which only outwardly came out in defence of the Turkish sultan, while in actuality it was supporting the struggle of revolutionary Turkey against Anglo-Greek intervention. The role played in this movement by Mahatma Gandhi, who rightfully viewed it not only as an opportunity to support the liberation struggle of the Turks but also as an effective means of drawing Hindus and Moslems closer together in his own country, is well known. In 1922, at the initiative of Jawaharlal Nehru, the INC sent a congratulatory message to the Turkish people on the occasion of its final triumph over the interventionists. In 1924 an energetic resolution was passed in support of the anti-imperialist movement of the Egyptian people, and in 1927 the Indian National Congress demanded that Indian soldiers be recalled from among the Anglo-Indian troops that were being used against the liberation movements in China, Iraq and Persia.

The year 1927 was of particular importance for consolidating the INC's international and inter-Asian ties on an anticolonialist basis. In February of that year Brussels hosted the Congress of the League Against Imperialism in which Jawaharlal Nehru took part as the INC representative. There were 175 delegates including 13 Indians there, representing 134 organisations. More than 300 guests from India, China, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Korea, Indonesia, Indochina, Japan, North America and from most European states also attended it. Among the delegates were Ho Chi Minh, the would-be Vice-President of Indonesia, Mohammad Hata, and the future President of Senegal, Leopold Senghor. Albert

Einstein and Romain Rolland took an active part in the congress.

In his address to the congress, Nehru assailed the colonial policy of British imperialism. He stressed that the British bosses of India were using Anglo-Indian troops in their punitive expeditions against Egypt, Iraq, Afghanistan and Burma. Therefore, he pointed out, the liberation of India from British oppression would be of tremendous importance not only for its people, but also for many other countries of Asia and Africa, as it would spell the beginning of the end for the British Empire.

The foremost document of the congress was its Manifesto, which read in part. "... The oppressed and enslaved nations which represent the overwhelming majority of mankind, like the proletariat, can conquer the world, the world of the future.

"Oppressed Peoples and Oppressed Nations, Unite!"

The Brussels congress adopted a decision to form an authoritative international organisation, the Anti-Imperialist League, whose executive committee included prominent figures in the liberation movement of the Eastern peoples, Jawaharlal Nehru included. At his initiative the INC officially joined this league and began contributing membership dues.

It the late 20s-early 30s contacts between the officials of the INC and other liberation movements continued to strengthen. In 1930 Mahatma Gandhi, who five years earlier had expressed his admiration for the heroic struggle of the Rif tribes against French and Spanish colonialists, had a meeting in Port Said during his trip to London with the leaders of the Wafd Party, during which they discussed the anti-imperialist movement. In 1935 the INC strongly protested against Italian aggression on Ethiopia. In 1938 Nehru visited Egypt twice, where he discussed with Wafd leaders the struggle of both countries against British imperialism. The follow-

ing year a Wafd delegation visited India for a similar purpose. During those years the INC reinforced its contacts with national organisations in Iraq and Burma, and in 1939 Nehru left for China to study its methods of struggle against the Japanese colonialists. As early as 1936 an international ties bureau was set up under the INC Working Committee at Nehru's initiative, which he himself later took charge of.

Obviously, during numerous meetings among the leaders of anti-imperialist liberation movements of Asian countries which took place in the 20s and 30s the sides also discussed their relations after the attainment of independence. The question that was discussed most was the creation in future of a federation of independent Eastern states. The formation of an Asian Federation was also one of the policy-making provisions of the Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party set up on January 1, 1923. Mahatma Gandhi himself repeatedly spoke about the common destiny of the Asian countries.

Prominent Indian historian Bimal Prasad claims in his book *The Origins of Indian Foreign Policy* that the leading politicians of the Indian National Congress believed in the Federation of Asian States, which would pave the shortest way to independence and enable Asia to play a fitting role in world politics. In 1921 Jawaharlal Nehru supported the idea, observing that it would promote stronger relations among India's neighbours. The following year the Working Committee of the INC officially voiced its interest in the federation idea.

In 1926 INC president S. Ayengar tabled for discussion at the 41st session of the All-India Committee of the Congress the draft of the constitution of a "Federation of Asian Democracies" for the common benefit of the peoples of Asia. During the discussion of this resolution the expediency of the Soviet Union's participation in it as well was underscored. In the intervening years

this problem was heatedly discussed at various forums involving Nehru and other prominent Congress figures.

The ties between India and other Asian countries broke down during the Second World War, and after the arrest in 1942 of not only the leaders but all the active Congress figures, the discussion of the prospects for the future foreign policies of the Asian countries was temporarily suspended.

The situation, however, changed drastically in 1945 with the triumph of the antifascist coalition, in which the decisive role was played by the Soviet armed forces. Recently declassified documents from the archives of many of the belligerents attest to the fact that the peoples of Asia were threatened with enslavement not only in the event Nazi Germany and militarist Japan were victorious, but also if the final rout of Japan was dragged out to late 1946 or even early 1947. This was part of the plans of the European colonisers and the US, who hoped to use this period of time to transfer British, French, Dutch and American troops to South and Southeast Asia and to the Far East to recolonise this huge region under the guise of liberating a large part of it from the Japanese yoke. However, the rout of crack units of Japan's Kwantung Army by the Soviet armed forces in two weeks cancelled out all these plans. A clear-cut prospect was opened up for the triumph of the antifascist, anti-imperialist national-liberation revolution in China and Korea, the prerequisites were created for the victory of anti-imperialist movements in Southeast Asian countries, and the independence of Indonesia and Vietnam was proclaimed.

That the colonial system of imperialism had been undermined was felt even during the UN Conference on International Organisation, which opened in San Francisco in April 1945, when the Soviet armed forces launched the assault on Berlin. This conference was at-

tended not only by official representatives of the UN founding countries, but also by unofficial delegations from a number of Asian countries.

The British colonisers realised that in the international situation that had taken shape at the time India could not be excluded from among the UN founding countries. Taking advantage of the circumstance that formally it was still designated as a colony, the British authorities paid particular attention to the formation of an "Indian" delegation to prevent it from becoming a hub around which anti-imperialist forces could be concentrated in San Francisco. For this reason Moslem figures and opponents of the Congress were included in it. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar was appointed delegation head. From 1939 he had been a member of the Executive Council of the Viceroy and from 1942—represented India in the British War Cabinet in London and enjoyed Churchill's complete trust.

However, in parallel, an unofficial Indian delegation headed by Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Nehru's sister and subsequently India's first ambassador to Moscow, arrived in San Francisco. It was this delegation that attracted all anti-colonial forces in San Francisco. At a press conference Vijayalakshmi Pandit frankly stated that she was concerned for the future of a number of Asian countries, inasmuch as "clarity is lacking in the intentions of the British, French and Dutch authorities on the given question". On May 4 she submitted a memorandum for consideration by the Conference on International Organisation, noting in it that she considers it her duty to come out not only in the interests of India but in the interests of all countries that are unable to speak out for themselves. All this, of course, reinforced the trend towards Asian unity, especially as the developments at San Francisco were widely covered in the international press, the Indian press included.

In June 1945 came the long-awaited news of Nehru's release from prison, where the British colonisers had thrown him in August 1942. Vijayalakshmi Pandit and many members of other official and unofficial delegations of Asian countries in San Francisco sent letters and telegrams to Nehru urging him to come to promote the struggle of the democratic forces at the UN Conference on International Organisation in order to accelerate the granting of independence to Asian countries. Many messages expressed the wish that Nehru take over the post of foreign minister in the would-be Indian government to further the immediate establishment of diplomatic relations with Asian countries.

In his reply Nehru explained that it would be impossible for him to come to San Francisco, citing the fact that the Viceroy of India had scheduled a conference in Simla for late June, where the forms and the time-frame in which India would be granted independence were to be worked out with the participation of leaders of the country's main political parties. Typically, Vijayalakshmi Pandit stressed that Nehru's presence at the Simla conference was imperative not only for India but for the successful resolution of many of the problems plaguing Asia. On behalf of the Asian delegates she urged Nehru to take into account "the sympathies and support of the Asian public, which pins great hopes on India's new role" while elaborating his stand at Simla. Influential Indian newspaper *The Hindu* published this telegram which indubitably helped consolidate the positions of the INC delegation at Simla not only vis-a-vis the British colonisers but also the active supporters of India's dismemberment headed by Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League.

Meanwhile, heated debates continued in June 1945 in San Francisco among the delegates and representatives of Asian countries and public organisations concerned

over the future of their countries and peoples. It was then that the idea of the need for convening an Asian conference emerged. Public and political figures in Asian and some African countries had highly unpleasant memories of the League of Nations, which they had called "a white people's club". For this reason most of the delegates of the UN founding states from Asia decided to insist on the holding of an Asian conference that alone could promote their interests in the would-be United Nations Organisation.

Vijayalakshmi Pandit was handed a document vesting Nehru with official powers to convene such a conference. The INC leaders energetically supported this proposal. In late June, Mahatma Gandhi vigorously came out in support of the development not only of inter-Asian but also Afro-Asian ties. The INC Working Committee demanded that Britain "eliminate traces of imperialist control in Asia".

This demand covered not only a cessation of the British colonial rule over many regions of Asia but also to the withdrawal of Indian contingents from the body of British occupation troops stationed in Southeast Asia. In the latter half of 1945 there were over a million effectives of the British armed forces, including upwards of 700,000 Indians, in this area. In October 1945 there were three Indian divisions included among the Anglo-Dutch forces that had occupied Indonesia.

All this gave the Indian poetess and prominent public figure Sarojini Naidu, who was INC president back in 1925, and in 1947 had become chairperson of the organising committee for the convocation of the Delhi conference, grounds to state in November 1945 that instead of remaining India's friends, Asian countries, its neighbours, had become its enemies, as Indian troops were being used there to suppress their liberation

movements under the control and supervision of the imperialist colonisers.

In this fashion the British colonisers improved upon the old "divide and rule" principle of the Roman colonisers. They not only had India torn away from other countries, above all those of Southeast Asia; but they also sought to fan conflicts among ethnic groups by portraying Indians as collaborators in colonial pillage. Realising this, Abul Kalam Azad, who held the post of INC president at the time (his book *India Achieves Freedom* was published in 1961 in Moscow in Russian translation, under this author's editorship), proposed to the INC Working Committee in October 1945 to consider seriously the steps that should be taken to prevent Indian manpower and material resources from being used against the Asian peoples fighting for their independence.

Inasmuch as the British colonial authorities refused to comply with this demand and the Anglo-Dutch intervention against the fledgling Republic of Indonesia continued, Nehru decided in late October to visit Java to acquaint himself with the situation on the spot. However, the British authorities refused him an exit visa even after President Sukarno sent a personal message to Viceroy Lord Wavell. Then President Sukarno broadcast the following address to Nehru via the Bandung radio station: "We are experiencing extreme difficulty in propaganda means and pin our hopes on India, on you, to promote the goals and tasks of the Indonesian struggle." Sukarno granted India "the right to speak before world public opinion in defence of Indonesia".

All this exerted a great influence on the public and working people of the countries of the Far East and Oceania. Dock workers in China and Australia refused to send military supplies to Indonesia. In a joint appeal to Indian dock workers Azad and Nehru urged them to

follow this example, as: "Indonesian freedom is vitally important not only for India but for the whole of Asia". Solidarity with Asian countries also began to turn into an international unifying factor, fusing different social and national groups of the Indian population.

In October 1945 Nehru made a special statement to the Indian press in which he expressed indignation not only against the policy of the British, French and Dutch colonisers, who were attempting to restore their domination over the peoples of Burma, Malaya, Indochina and Indonesia, but also against the shameful stand of the United States which supported the actions of the European imperialists in Asia, evidently proceeding from its own interests. This, he said, could lead only to an ongoing uprising of millions with a mounting force that even an atom bomb will not be able to suppress and which can conclude in a third world war.

In November 1945 Nehru made an attempt to get an exit visa to visit Indochina. The refusal of the authorities to grant it evoked great public indignation. "Southeast Asia Day" was held in India on October 28, 1945, and "Indonesia Day" on November 20. The desire to further the anti-imperialist movement of the Eastern peoples, which in autumn 1945 was becoming increasingly widespread among the Indian population, did not confine itself to Southeast Asia. In October-November 1945 "Palestine Days" were held in Delhi and Hyderabad. A special message by Azad in this connection read: "We must declare to the whole world that the Palestinian problem does not affect the Arabs alone and that India is with them."

Asian public and political figures heatedly discussed future close cooperation among the emergent nations of the East simultaneously with support for the liberation movement of the peoples of Southeast Asia and the Middle East. Back in August 1945 Nehru prepared a

draft for the creation of a South Asian Association which he visualised as an alliance between Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and Burma, on the one hand, and a "united India", on the other. After the atom-bombing of Japan, Nehru spent some time discussing the question of a "joint defence of Asia", "for, in the age of the atom bomb, small countries will never be able to ensure their own defence". In September he proposed discussing the possible formation of a "federation of Asian nations". This problem was discussed in detail in late September at a session of the INC Working Committee. Supporting Nehru's idea on the whole, the Working Committee only proposed the replacement of the term "federation" with "association". The resolution passed to the effect underscored India's special desire to elaborate in conjunction with China, Burma, Malaya, Ceylon, Indonesia and the Middle East countries "a common policy for the purposes of defence, trade and economic and cultural development".

In December 1945 Nehru received a letter from the Burmese national-liberation movement leader Aung San, who later in effect became the country's Prime Minister, but was murdered in 1947 by a band of reactionaries linked with colonial quarters. In his message Aung San advanced specific proposals on the convocation of a conference of Asian countries in the immediate future. Nehru liked the proposals so much that on December 26 he sent him a telegram, expressing his complete approval and readiness for concrete action.



Mahatma Gandhi addressing the Asian Relations Conference on April 1, 1947.



Jawaharlal Nehru hosted a dinner for the heads of the delegations. On his right are an Indonesian delegate and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and on his left are a Burmese and a Soviet delegate.



People on way to the inaugural session of the Asian Relations Conference.

ASIAN RELATIONS 1947 COMMEMORATIVE CONFERENCE

2-5 October 1987



October 2, 1987. Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi, inaugurates the Asian Relations Commemorative Conference at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi.



A view of the presidium of the Asian Relations Commemorative Conference.



The commemorative conference was attended by a Soviet delegation led by Prof. Mikhail Kapitsa, Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow and Chairman of the USSR Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

tem and other problems of Indian polity. He was a member of the unofficial Indian delegation at the UN constituent conference in San Francisco, where together with Vijayalakshmi Pandit, he took an active part in the discussion of problems connected with the future of Asian countries. Subsequently, in 1969, a five-volume collection of documents on the history of the creation of the Indian Constitution was published under his editorship. In his talk with Shiva Rao, Nehru observed that the formation of an Asian federation "could become a reality in the not-too-distant future". This would hinge largely on the effectiveness of the UN's activity.

Nehru believed that if this organisation did not fulfil its obligations, groupings of countries would appear in Asia that would arrogate to themselves the functions of "defending themselves against external aggression". Their sphere of competence, he felt, could come to include not only military questions, but also defence against "the economic penetration of the imperialist powers". Also of considerable interest in the light of the present situation was Nehru's conviction that in future there would emerge an "alliance of Indian Ocean countries", the goal of which would be cooperation among its members in defence and trade. In his interview Nehru for the first time officially supported the idea of the convocation of an Asian conference in India. He stressed that it would not be aimed either against the US or the USSR.

To create the material base for the would-be conference Nehru took part in organising a number of rallies in Bombay in January 1946, as a result of which over Rs.100,000 were collected for the Asian conference fund.

In March 1946 Nehru finally got the opportunity to visit Singapore and Malaya. In his numerous speeches

before representatives of Indian communities he highlighted the problems of independence of Asian countries and the prospects for their cooperation on an anti-imperialist basis. This time, too, the British colonisers prohibited him from visiting Burma. However, due to inclement weather, the airplane on which Nehru was returning from Malaya made a forced night landing in Rangoon, where he had a talk with Aung San, which was an upshot of their correspondence. Thus the outlines of the would-be Asian conference gradually took shape. These were subsequently deepened and clarified as a result of his correspondence with Ho Chi Minh, Sukarno and the Wafd leaders.

In spring 1946 the situation was very tense in India. As a consequence of the mass upsurge of the anti-imperialist movement in the country, the deep-going crisis of the colonial system, and the drastic worsening of the socio-economic and financial situation of Great Britain and the change in the alignment of forces between the two world camps in favour of socialism, the Labour government of Great Britain was forced to agree to leave India and grant it the status of a dominion. At the same time, however, inter-community relations became extremely exacerbated in the country with the energetic support of the colonial administration. The Muslim League was ever more insistently demanding that India be dismembered and Pakistan be formed for the Muslims.

Against this background talks were being held between the Viceroy and the leaders of different parties and organisations, particularly the Muslim League and the INC, on the formation of a "provisional government" in which Nehru was expected to hold the posts of vice-chairman and foreign minister, which was what happened later, in September 1946.

Under the circumstances, Nehru and the INC Work-

ing Committee considered it expedient to entrust the Indian Council of World Affairs, a public organisation set up back in 1943, with all the work involved in preparing for and holding the Asian conference. This was formalised by an exchange of letters between Nehru and the officials of this organisation. A decision was taken to call this forum the Conference on Inter-Asian Relations, to hold it in March-April 1947 in Delhi, and to invite delegations from 28 states, including observers from the UN, the League of Arab States and six major research institutes dealing with Asian problems.

Despite the opposition of a number of right-wing groups linked with the INC and the Indian Council of World Affairs, Nehru had the delegations of eight Soviet republics—Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia—included among the conference participants. All the invitations were sent out in September 1946. A wish was expressed that the delegations comprise most prominent representatives of the scientific and cultural communities of the Asian countries, and government institutions be represented by observers. The Pacific Institute, which was functioning at that time within the system of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was included among the six research institutes that were invited to take part in the Delhi conference.

Documents in the state archives of Great Britain attest to the fact that London decided to make every effort to torpedo this "pan-Asian" conference and under no circumstances allow representatives from the republics of the Soviet East come to Delhi. The apparatus of the Ministry for Indian Affairs and the Foreign Ministry of Great Britain, the closest associates of the Viceroy and several members of his Executive Council were set in motion. Inasmuch as India still did not have its diplomatic representatives abroad, some of the invitations

which had been sent upon Nehru's instructions through British diplomatic channels to the leaders of mideast countries were "lost". As could only be expected, a similar fate befell the invitations sent to the Soviet republics and the Pacific Institute in Moscow. However, Nehru proved foresighted—duplicates of the invitations were handed over by Vijayalakshmi Pandit through the UN, and by Krishna Menon, president of London Majlis and later one of Nehru's closest comrades-in-arms and India's defence minister—to the diplomatic representatives of a number of states in the British capital.

British agents also brought into play Muslim League leader M.A. Jinnah, who demanded that the conference be cancelled as this was supposedly an attempt by the Congress "to spread its influence outside India". France protested against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam being invited, and then prevented Ho Chi Minh from coming to Delhi.

Under the circumstances Nehru and the conference organising committee were forced to make a certain compromise. In early March 1947 it was stated that the conference would deal solely with cultural, economic and demographical problems, which evoked the dissatisfaction of the officials of Indonesia and the DRV, who had hoped to receive the support of the conference for their liberation struggle against the Dutch and French colonisers.

Finally, it was decided to discuss at the plenary sessions, sections and round-table talks the following eight priorities: 1. The national liberation movements; 2. Racial problems; 3. Inter-Asian population migration; 4. The transition from colonial to national economies; 5. The restructuring of agriculture and industrial development; 6. Problems of labour and social development; 7. Cultural problems, and 8. The status of women and the women's movement.

The delegations of all the invited countries and research institutes—from Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burma, Ceylon, Vietnam, Georgia, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Cambodia, China, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Korea, Malaya, Mongolia, Palestine, Philippines, Siam, Tibet, Tajikistan, Turkmenia and Uzbekistan—came to the conference. Several arrived late. Also attending were observers from the UN, the League of Arab States, the Pacific Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Pacific Institute of the USA (New York), the Institute of International Relations (London), the Indian Institute (London) and Australian Institute of International Relations and Political Sciences (Sydney).

As has already been pointed out, the first Asian Relations Conference opened in Delhi on March 23, 1947 before 10,000 people. In the presidium were Jawaharlal Nehru, members of the organising committee and the heads of all the delegations. A specially prepared map of Asia hung on the huge wall behind the presidium. The flags of the member-countries were flying as well. There were only 16 of them, as not all the Asian states had designed their national flags yet.

At the first plenary session Nehru delivered his famous speech "Asia Finds Herself Again" Noting that the idea of the conference had become widespread in Asia, he said: "There was a widespread urge and an awareness that the time had come for us, peoples of Asia, to meet together, to hold together and to advance together." The speaker mentioned with particular warmth the delegates and representatives from the "Soviet Republics of Asia which have advanced so rapidly in our generation and which have so many lessons to teach us." Dismissing canards spread by the opponents of the conference regarding India's supposed ambition to gain a dominating influence in Asia, Nehru replied: "We have no designs against anybody; ours is th,

great design of promoting peace and progress all over the world. Far too long have we of Asia have been petitioners in Western courts and chancellories. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and to cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be playthings of others."

Nehru's speech made an enormous impression not only on those present but literally on the public at large, since it was printed fully or in large excerpts in many newspapers. Particular attention was called to Nehru's sagacious indication of the role Asia was to play in the atomic age. It is not at all accidental that it was this tenet from his speech that Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi cited in his speech at a luncheon given in honour of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on November 25, 1986 in Delhi. Rajiv Gandhi said: "Jawaharlal Nehru convened an Asian Relations Conference here in New Delhi in March 1947, in which the Asian Republics of the Soviet Union also participated. He declared 'In this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed, there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part. There is today conflict in many countries, and all of us in Asia are full of our own troubles. Nevertheless, the whole spirit and outlook of Asia are peaceful, and the emergence of Asia in world affairs will be a powerful influence for world peace'."

Such was the interplay of ages and generations—the baton of the struggle for peace and Asia's vigorous involvement in the efforts against colonialism and the threat of atomic war which Jawaharlal Nehru had handed over to Indira Gandhi, has now been picked up by the young, energetic Prime Minister of great India, Rajiv Gandhi.

A heated debate was held during the sectional meet-

ings and plenary sessions of the 1947 conference on the national-liberation movements, opposition to possible aggressors and colonisers, and on the expansion of economic and cultural ties among the Asian countries.

The eight problems mentioned earlier were dealt with in five discussion groups, each of which held a free round-table debate for one or two days. At the plenary concluding session which was attended by all members of the delegations and the observers who took part in the discussion of the given problem, a joint report was adopted with appropriate supplements and amendments.

As could be expected, the most heated debate was around the national-liberation movements. Different stands were discovered. For example, the delegates of Burma and Ceylon and one of the observers from Cambodia drew attention to the circumstance that the British colonisers had used a large number of Indian troops in their attempts to recolonise their former possessions. They used the bases situated on the Indian territory to supply the Indian troops. The delegates from Ceylon and Malaya pointed to the possible danger that after the end of the British colonial rule, Indian and Chinese capital could predominate their economies.

A number of facts showed that the British imperialists, employing diplomatic channels and other levers of influence, had on their part carried out careful preparations against the Delhi conference in order to forestall the possibility of any united front of Asian countries against imperialism being built.

In connection with the tense situation that had taken shape, Nehru was invited to the round-table session. Stating that he was acting not only as the honorary president of the conference but also as the foreign minister of the Provisional Government of India, he reported that back in November 1946 all Ind

units had been recalled from the body of British occupation forces in Southeast Asian countries. He also stated that he knew nothing of the presence of any supply bases for these troops on the Indian territory, and that this report would be investigated and, if the fact was confirmed, the bases would be closed. In this way, he expeditiously thwarted British attempts to undermine the edifice of Southeast Asian unity that was being built. This episode is highly typical because Western special services to this day continue their attempts to scare the Southern and Southeast Asian countries with the "Indian menace", employing for the purpose ethnic conflicts, religious and community clashes and nationalist and chauvinist groupings of individual countries.

The participants in the round-table discussion on the national-liberation movements adduced graphic illustrations of subterfuge by Western colonisers in the Southeast Asian countries. For example, a member of the Vietnamese delegation described in detail the attempts by the French colonisers to compromise Ho Chi Minh in order to isolate the communists of Indochina from the other groupings and organisations fighting colonialism. Another method the French colonisers resorted to was to set up puppet states of the Cochin-China type, which was governed by a French puppet.

Of considerable interest in the light of the present situation in the Indian Ocean was the speech by one of the members of the Ceylonese delegation, who claimed that even after it formally left its colonial possessions, Great Britain would try to preserve its dominance in the Indian Ocean and would do all in its power to keep intact its naval bases in Ceylon and Malaya.

No less topical for today was the proposal by one of the members of the Indonesian delegation to initiate the fight against the monopoly of the Western news agencies. Their coverage of the situation in Asian countries,

specifically, Southeast Asia, where armed struggle against imperialism continued, was extremely tendentious, and served the interests of the colonial and neo-colonial quarters of the West. For this reason a proposal was made to discuss the possibility of setting up a news agency of the Asian countries.

Of specific interest are the materials of the final session of the national-liberation movement group, where, in keeping with the regulations, the joint report on the outcome of the preceding round-table debates was discussed. The session was opened by Nehru, who introduced to the participants the Indonesian Prime Minister, Sutan Shariar, who had arrived in Delhi on March 30 in a plane sent for him from India on Nehru's instructions. Sutan Shariar spoke in detail about the agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands that had been signed in Linggajati on March 25, 1947, in accordance with which the Dutch colonisers de facto recognised the Republic of Indonesia.

The movement of solidarity with the liberation struggle of the Indonesian people, in which the working people of South Asia, the Far East and Australia took an active part, the decision of the Interim Government of India adopted at the INC's insistence to recall Indian subunits from the body of Anglo-Dutch occupation troops in Indonesia, and the consolidation of ties among the peoples of Asia in connection with the Delhi conference undoubtedly played a substantial role in the concessions which the Dutch colonisers were forced to make under the Linggajati agreement.

Nehru also introduced to the conferees the Korean delegation, which had arrived at the Delhi conference late. He stressed the political importance of the fact that the conference on inter-Asian relations was being attended by representatives of different regions of this ancient continent. After the address by the Korean

STRUGGLE FOR ASIAN UNITY & SECURITY

delegation head, a special paragraph in which hope was expressed that "the occupation of Korea by the allies would soon come to an end and that Korea would thus gain full independence" was included in the joint report of the national-liberation movement group.

As early as the Moscow conference of the foreign ministers of the USSR, the US and Great Britain in December 1945, the Soviet government was pressing for Korea's revival as a single, independent and democratic state. By late 1946 it had withdrawn its forces from the territory of North Korea. The neocolonialist circles of the United States had hampered the decision on the formation of a single Korea, doing all in their power to engineer a split in the country. In 1950, they organised the unleashing of a war of aggression against the DPRK by the South Korean regime they had created. To this day there are over 40,000 American soliders stationed in the Republic of Korea (South Korea), which was set up at the direct instance of Washington. The American neoglobalists are working hard today to create an aggressive Washington-Seoul-Tokyo axis.

The participants in the round-table discussion on the national-liberation movement paid a great deal of attention to the possibility of joint action by Asian countries to thwart attempt by the old colonisers to restore their empires, and also the intrigues of neocolonialists. This question was discussed at two round-table sessions and then at the group's final session, during which a number of substantial changes and supplementaries were introduced into the respective sections of the joint report.

The debate was inaugurated by a member of the Malayan delegation, a jurist named J.A. Thivy from Kuala Lumpur, who was an Indian by nationality. He proposed the setting up of a "Neutral Bloc of Asian Countries" to counter would-be aggressors. Several

delegates opposed this idea, believing, for one thing, that a bloc would mean pitting Asia against Europe and America and, for another, neutrality would be insufficient for opposing the armed forces of the colonisers. Replying to these objections, Thivy explained that his proposal had more multifaceted tasks. He believed that this bloc would "immobilise the forces" of a potential aggressor by refusing his ships permission to enter Asian ports, his aircraft to land at air-fields, and his armed forces to receive food and all types of supplies and ammunition in Asian countries.

Despite the fact that a final decision on this question was not taken, it was incorporated not only into the round-table materials but also in the joint report of the national-liberation movement group.

That the Thivy proposal made a much greater impression than is evident from the joint report is shown by Nehru's decision to invite its author to work at the fledgling Indian foreign ministry. He subsequently was appointed as the Indian ambassador to Lebanon, Italy and other countries.

The delegates of Indonesia and Vietnam—countries which were waging an energetic struggle against the colonisers at that time—insisted on a more precise definition of the stand of Asian countries in the event of aggression against a former colony. The delegate from vietnam proposed, by way of amending the Thivy draft, the setting up of a sort of "fighting federation". Mentioning the Monroe Doctrine and the plans to form a West European federation, the representative of struggling Vietnam stated: "We in Asia should create one big federation aimed not against Europe or against America, but one that is created to fight for and defend our freedom." The delegates from more moderate countries did not go that far, of course. Nevertheless, the joint report included an agreed formulation, which

read: "We believe that Asia as a whole should elaborate a stand that would prevent imperialism from continuing its domination over any part of the continent."

Interest was also generated by the proposal of a member of the Indonesian delegation to the effect that all Asian countries should immediately recognise the Republic of Indonesia *de jure*. The objection of a delegate from Philippine to the effect that under international law only fully sovereign Asian states could recognise the Republic of Indonesia *de jure* was parried by a delegate from Burma, who stressed that the conference had been convened not to observe the extant international conventions but to extend, first and foremost, a hand in friendship to the Asian peoples fighting for freedom.

The speech by Prof. V. Kupradze, the head of the delegation from Soviet Georgia, was heard with great attention. He pointed to the connection between friendship among peoples, the freedom of the ethnic minorities and cultural ties among the Asian peoples. This speech was instrumental in a very important provision being included in the joint report, namely: "A consensus has been reached on the point that the national-liberation movements in the Asian countries should also pursue the goal of ensuring political, economic, social and cultural democracy for all their peoples."

hard to dispel these suspicions. An Indian delegate stressed that the Interim Indian Government and the INC Working Committee believed that the Indians living in these countries should above all concern themselves with developing the economies and feel like subjects of the countries of residence.

Of considerable interest in the light of the current acute ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka is the address 40 years ago at the first round-table session by a member of the Ceylonese delegation who, referring to the role the British colonisers were playing in the exacerbating conflict between the Sinhalese and the Tamils, stressed that non-interference by the colonial authorities in this delicate problem was a prime prerequisite for its settlement.

A great impression was made on the round-table participants by the speech of M.A. Yusupov, a member of the delegation from Azerbaijan, who drew attention to the need to fight all manifestations of racism. "We, representatives of Asian peoples," he said, "must emphasise in our report that we strongly condemn all racist theories which the colonisers use to establish their domination over the Eastern peoples." This proposal was vigorously supported by Vijayalakshmi Pandit who, dispelling the doubts of some indecisive delegates who were apprehensive of too sharp a condemnation of the colonisers, stated that she would not understand if the Asian countries, while pressing in the UN for the denunciation of racism to be included in the fundamental resolutions of that organisation, failed to have these provisions included in the resolution of their own conference.

The third group examined the problems involved in the transition from colonial to national economies, agricultural restructuring, industrial development, labour and social development. Considering the tremendous

importance of these problems for countries that were liberating themselves from the age-old colonial yoke which had deformed their economies and hampered their industrial development, nine round-table sessions and one concluding session for adopting the joint report were devoted to these questions.

Taking part in the debates and discussions were prominent scientists, and public and political figures from Asian countries who subsequently held important posts in the key spheres of state administration. Thus, Ceylonese delegation member SWRD Bandaranaike became the Prime Minister of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in 1956 and remained in office until his murder in 1959 by reactionaries. Humayun Kabir of the Indian delegation became minister of research and culture in 1958, and his colleague, Prof. K.M. Panikkar, the author of the famous work *Asia and Western Dominance*, the ambassador to China and Egypt. S. Radhakrishnan became the ambassador to the USSR, and then Vice-President and President of India, etc.

During these sessions a detailed discussion was held on the prospects for the restoration of the undermined economies of the Eastern countries, ways of accelerating their agricultural development, and the specifics of industrialisation. A number of delegates cautioned against the danger of neocolonialism, which would manifest itself in the attempts to maintain control of the economic development of its former colonies. Proposals were tabled on limiting the share of foreign capital in future industrial enterprises in Asian countries and especially on establishing a firm limit on the export of profits in hard currency by the Western monopolies.

The speeches by members of delegations from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Armenia about the specifics of non-capitalist development of these republics, the transition from the nomadic movement of population to

a settled way of life, successes in industrialisation, and the rapid advance of agriculture were heard with great attention.

The group's joint report on agricultural restructuring pointed to the importance of studying the experience of agricultural collectivisation in the Soviet Eastern republics.

The joint report on industrialisation underscored the impressive successes the Soviet Eastern republics had attained in this area. The entire section of the joint report on labour and social problems dealt with a description of the rights and possibilities of the working people of the Soviet East in receiving education, housing and jobs. It noted the elimination of inequality between mental and physical labour and the rapidly rising living standards in these republics.

Similar comments on the attainments of the Soviet Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics were incorporated in the joint reports of the groups dealing with cultural problems and the status of women.

The most heated discussions revolved around the creation of a coordinating body of the Asian states—the Asian Relations Organisation (ARO). This is what the colonisers were most apprehensive of, since the point at issue was coordinating the liberation movements, especially in countries which were still languishing under the foreign yoke, and pooling efforts by the emergent Asian countries against the neocolonialist threat. For this reason directives were sent from London to Delhi, to the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, who had replaced Wavell just a day before the conference opened, and also through the newly-established diplomatic channels of the Interim Government of India. London demanded that the formation of a coordinating body be thwarted at all costs.

It was also decided to take advantage of the reluct-

ance of the Kuomintang delegation from China to allow a permanent body of the Asian countries to be set up on Indian territory.

Initially it seemed that the opponents of this organisation which was joined by a part of the Indian delegates as well, would emerge victorious through pooled efforts. A tense situation was created in the conference ad hoc subcommittee discussing the draft of a resolution on the formation of the ARO. The first two sessions of the subcommittee, on March 25 and 27, were deadlocked with the problem. Furthermore, at the second session most of the participants opted against any permanent body for various reasons. Then Nehru urgently summoned Mahatma Gandhi from Bihar, who had been unable to attend the beginning of the conference due to an outbreak of Hindu-Muslim strife in Patna. He arrived in the night of March 31 and, since there were two days to go before the end of the conference, it was decided to have him speak on the morning of April 1 at the general plenary session of the participants of the third group, where the joint report on labour and social development problems was being discussed. The news of Gandhi's forthcoming address brought virtually all the conferees to the hall.

In his speech Mahatma Gandhi said that the previous evening he had discussed the possible creation of a permanent body of Asian countries with Nehru and had arrived at the conclusion that it would be expedient to set up such an institution. "I believe, respected delegates from different Asian countries," he said, "that you should meet once a year or at least once every two or three years. . . The idea of forming a permanent body of such a conference is very substantial." In conclusion, Gandhi made it clear that it was expedient to set it up in India. "If you ask me where, I would say India is the

place, You will forgive me that partiality for India", he said.

The third session of the subcommittee was convened in the evening of April 1 in Nehru's residence and under his chairmanship. It adopted a final decision on the formation of the Asian Relations Organisation, which was to be headed by a provisional General Council. Nehru was elected the council chairman.

A mournful ciphered telegram which the Viceroy's office sent to London on April 2 read: "Having won a victory at the initial stage in this highly important question, we ultimately suffered defeat, for Nehru brought out the heavy artillery against his opponents—Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, against whom no one could hold out."

The content of this telegram, which was first cited by this author in his paper on the 40th anniversary of the Delhi conference at a session of the Indian Council of World Affairs in February 1987, generated keen interest among the audience, including representatives of the Indian press.

The final plenary session of the Asian Relations Conference was held on April 2. It was attended, besides all the delegations, by members of the Interim Government of India, foreign diplomats and the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, by 20,000 people. The session was addressed by the heads of delegations of a number of countries who had arrived late for the opening of the conference, including the head of the delegation from Mongolia, Lubsan Vandan. He voiced confidence that the conference decisions would be implemented. Speeches of greetings to the conference were delivered by the head of the Egyptian delegation Azzam Bey and Indonesian Prime Minister Sutan Shariar. The latter expressed confidence that the solidarity of the nations of Asia would indubitably help all its countries and peoples at-

tain independence in the immediate future and promote favourable conditions for their economic and cultural development.

The head of the Vietnamese delegation read out the greetings from President Ho Chi Minh, in which the point was made that the success of the conference was the success of all the peoples of Asia. It also expressed the profound gratitude of the people of Vietnam for the substantial aid which the people of India were rendering to its liberation struggle.

The participants in the final session listened to the speeches of Gandhi and Nehru with great attention. A resolution was then passed which read: "The delegates from Asian countries who gathered for the first Asian Relations Conference in Delhi are firmly convinced that world peace can be real and lasting only if it is linked with the freedom and well-being of the peoples of Asia." Further on, it said that they were unanimous in the belief that the contact established at this conference should be preserved and strengthened and that the good work begun here should be continued, organised effectively and subsequently developed vigorously.

All the stages of the conference proceedings were widely covered in the press. The photograph of Nehru dressed in a bright Uzbek robe and skullcap which the Uzbek delegation head, President of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences T.A. Sarymsakov gave him to wear at the first plenary session, became highly popular.

The Western press closely followed the preparations for, and the course and results of the conference. *The New York Times* wrote: "The Western world will do well to watch carefully what was happening in Delhi since it may have large potentialities." The London-based *Times* observed: "The world has a new force to reckon with—the awakened spirit of Asia." The Indian press reprinted almost in full two articles which were

In late April 1947 the Southeast Asian countries learned of the plan of Dr. Abu Hanifah, head of the Indonesian delegation at the Asian Relations Conference, to hold in his country a conference of Southeast Asian countries as an intermediate stage of the preparations for the second inter-Asian conference. These very questions were discussed in July 1947 at a meeting of representatives of individual Southeast Asian countries in Bangkok. At the same time, youth detachments from India and several other Asian countries were gathering in Calcutta, the detachments being organised to render assistance to an embattled Vietnam. The appeal of Subhas Chandra Bose's brother—Sarat Chandra Bose—"Shed blood together with the youth of Indochina for the sake of Asian freedom" was circulated among them. These materials, which are contained in the presentation of this author to the scholars of the Netaji (Subhas Chandra Bose) Institute of Asian Studies in Calcutta in February 1987 generated keen interest of the audience and it was decided to use them in the publications of the institute.

After the Asian Relations Conference ended, an action programme was compiled for the Asian Relations Organisation. It featured 17 points, including the founding of an Academy of Asian Studies. Publication of the weekly *Asian Relations* began right during the proceedings of the conference. In 1948 it was replaced by the popular-science monthly *United Asia* (Bombay), which was brought out until the early 80s. National branches of the Asian Relations Organisation were set up in the late 40s-early 50s in Burma, Ceylon, Nepal and Malaya.

The Asian Relations Conference was doubtless largely instrumental in the conference being held in 1949 in Delhi at the governmental level. It again dealt with forms of inter-Asian unity, with due account for

the experience already accumulated, and elaborated an integral platform of struggle against the resumed Dutch intervention in Indonesia.

The ideas of the two Delhi conferences in turn played a prominent role in the drafting of the famous "Panchsheel" principles, which were first formalised in the preamble to the Indian-Chinese agreement of April 29, 1954. With the political sagacity peculiar to him, Jawaharlal made extensive use of the "Panchsheel" principles, combining them with other principles in preparing for and holding the historic Bandung conference of 1955.

General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev called to mind the stages of the Asian peoples' fight for freedom and security in his speech at Vladivostok on July 28, 1986: "Our views about security in the Asian-Pacific region did not come out of thin air. They take into account the experience of the past and of today. The principles of 'Panchsheel' and of Bandung have not sunk into oblivion. The positive examples of the truce in Korea, the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina, the Indo-Pakistani agreement in Tashkent live on in diplomatic experience."

These very problems were also discussed during the official visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to India in November 1986, in the course of which Rajiv Gandhi fondly recalled the Delhi conference of 1947 and its contribution to Asian unity for peace and security. The enormous experience which the Asian nations have amassed in the struggle for peace was extensively drawn on in the preparation of the famous Delhi Declaration, which Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi signed on November 27, 1986 and which became, as Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised during a question-and-answer session with the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka* on July 22, 1987, "an entirely new example of political and philosophical



Grigory Bondarevsky is the Head of the Section of International Relations Sociology at the Moscow Institute of Sociological Research of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He took his doctorate in history in 1965 and is a Professor specialising in international relations in Asia since 1966.

He has authored 26 research papers and books including such major research papers as *British Policy and International Relations in the Persian Gulf*; *Non-Aligned Movement: Its Friends and Enemies on the World Scene*; *Formation of the USSR and its Influence on the Foreign East* and *The West Against the Muslim East from the Crusades to Our Time*.

Bondarevsky has been the First Vice-President of the Committee of Soviet Friendship with South and South-East Asian nations. He often delivers lectures at universities in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines, Iran, Britain, the USA and the FRG.



Alexander Portnyagin

NEOGLOBALISM REACHING OUT

US military-political doctrines have
always had expansionist orientations

Alexander Portnyagin

NEOGLOBALISM REACHING OUT



ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

**AHMEDABAD BANGALORE BOMBAY CALCUTTA
HYDERABAD LUCKNOW MADRAS NEW DELHI**

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED

Prarthna Flats (1st Floor), Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

15 J.N. Heredia Marg, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400038

3-5-1129 Kachiguda Cross Road, Hyderabad 500027

16A Ashok Marg, Patiala House, Lucknow 226001

5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700072

13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110002

751 Mount Road, Madras 600002

First published, 1987

© Alexander Portnyagin, 1987

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION
4	HEGEMONISTIC DOCTRINES. BACKGROUND
8	US MILITARY BASES AND "LOW-INTENSITY" CONFLICTS
14	MILITARY BASES AND ASIAN-PACIFIC REGION
20	BASES. NUCLEAR AND SPACE ASPECTS
30	MYTHS DEBUNKED
39	SECURITY: THE ASIAN ASPECT

INTRODUCTION

To preserve peace and remove the threat of a global war—both nuclear and conventional—is the overriding task of our time. Mankind is now living through a crucial period of its history. Nuclear weapons threaten to destroy not only everything that civilization has created over centuries, but the very life on Earth.

What has brought the world to this dangerous brink? *The answer is unequivocal—a threat to peace on Earth* is created by the US war machine, the militaristic course of the US Administration, and its attempts to settle international problems from the positions of strength.

The military doctrine of a state is determined by its socio-economic system and its policy. It primarily reflects the attitude of a state to the fundamental issues of war and peace. In other words, the military doctrine of a state is a derivative of its social nature, prevailing ideology, and political course.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the US military doctrine is based on the idea of global hegemony, which was proclaimed in the beginning of the 20th century. Developing this idea in his message to the Congress in 1945, President Truman said that after World War II the American people were faced with a constant and compelling necessity of leading the world. Similar concepts were proclaimed by almost all post-

war American presidents. The gist of the current US military doctrine was also formulated after the end of World War II when the US was the only atomic power. Many things have changed since then. Statements by American presidents have become more flexible, and their claims to world domination more disguised. The US and the USSR, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are roughly equal in all kinds of arms. The US authorities, including the current Administration, are compelled to take into account the demands of the peace-loving public.

But it takes a lot of time to overcome old stereotypes. The imperialist strategists find it very hard to give up their archaic doctrines based on a striving for hegemony and military supremacy. Old concepts are being provided new garbs. It is enough to recall doctrines of "neoglobalism" or "low-intensity conflicts". Yet, their gist remains the same: as before, the United States wants to impose its will on the world, dictate its terms to sovereign nations, and restore its supremacy in the world.

bases and installations on the territory of 34 states and their possessions. More than 500,000 American servicemen are quartered on these bases. The United States is making broad use of military bases on the territory of other states to bring direct pressure to bear on their governments with a view to keeping them in the orbit of pro-American policy, threaten progressive regimes with the use of force, and give all-round aid to reactionary regimes in this or other region.

US military installations on foreign territory include depots of nuclear, neutron, chemical weapons, and ammunition, logistics support centres, posts of air and space observation, and coastal stations for the hydro-acoustic detection of submarines. These and other elements of the infrastructure provide support for the activities of US troops.

Not being content with its own ramified network of military bases, the United States is actively using different military objects of its allies and partners both in NATO, and in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is also looking for new strongpoints. At present, the Pentagon is having on lease or using many bases which it does not formally own. It also has military advisers and equipment on such bases. In addition to that the Pentagon is seeking access to dozens of other important military installations.

The formation and upkeep of a powerful network of military bases and strongpoints by the United States on foreign territory, the plans and practical actions on their build-up are a major component of US neoglobalist policy aimed at establishing a global domination.

encroachment on its sphere of interests, and a threat to its sovereignty. So, even then Washington made it abundantly clear that it was going to decide the destinies of its South American neighbours, thereby demonstrating its expansionist ambitions.

Events that followed confirmed the aggressive hegemonistic course of a state which had been born to the accompaniment of the high-sounding words about freedom and equality. Having settled its domestic problems (by depriving the Indians of their ancestral lands, for instance, Florida), the United States committed a number of aggressions against neighbouring Mexico, having captured about 250,000 hectares of its territory, including such extremely rich areas as California and Texas.

Indicatively, even in the early 19th century the United States tried to justify such actions as aggression, annexation of foreign lands, construction of military bases and strongpoints, or simply colonization, all of which run counter to international law, by the same pretexts which are used in its military-political doctrine today, notably, by concern about "national security". Thus, in 1805 US President Thomas Jefferson expressed his opinion to the effect that sooner or later the United States would have to seize Cuba, because foreign influence on Cuba would create the gravest threat to the security of such US regions as Louisiana and Florida. Independent Cuba did not suit Washington, either. In 1824 and 1829, respectively, the US Administration blocked the proposal of Mexico and a number of other Latin American countries to proclaim Cuba's independence once and for all.

On April 25, 1898 the United States declared war on Spain to which Cuba belonged at that time. A powerful expeditionary corps was sent to Cuba. Having won the war, the US formally proclaimed Cuba's independence,

but in reality it became a colonial possession for a long time to come. One puppet government was replaced by another, and quite a few American military bases appeared on Cuba.

The United States pursued a similar policy as regards other Latin American countries, such as Panama, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico, and El Salvador.

At the end of the past century the US noticeably extended the framework of its expansionist policy. The White House began to think in real earnest about spreading its influence not only in Latin America, but also in Asia and the Pacific. During its war against Spain the US sent large naval forces to the Philippines, which was a Spanish colony at that time.

The people of the Philippines rose in rebellion against the new colonizers under the leadership of Aguinaldo. It was at that time that the US applied its terror and scorched heat tactics that were used with "great success" and on a large scale during its aggression in Vietnam. The great American satirist Mark Twain wrote with bitter irony about the atrocities of the US Marines who were suppressing an uprising of a Filipino tribe: "We crushed them and spared not a single child because it might cry over his dead mother. Undoubtedly, this was the greatest victory ever scored by American soldiers..."

In 1849 the US naval fleet compelled the King of Hawaii, Kamehameha the Third, to grant American ships free access to the ports of the country. This was the beginning of the occupation of the Hawaii which led to its proclamation of the 50th state of the US in 1959.

Now Japan is justifiably called an "unsinkable aircraft-carrier" of the United States. Here the Pentagon has more than 120 military bases and installations. About 50,000 American servicemen are permanently quartered in Japan. But Japanese-US cooperation began

not at all at the will of Japan, but under pressure from the US which was stubbornly trying to reach out in the Far East in the middle of the 19th century. In 1854 American Admiral, Commodore Perry compelled the Japanese authorities to open Japan's ports for US warships by threatening to use force. Under US pressure Japan agreed to allow US warships to use the ports of Shimoda and Hakodate at any time.

These and other examples offer convincing evidence of the fact that literally from the first days of the proclamation of the US as an independent country, the military-political doctrines of practically all US Administrations were aimed at spreading the sphere of US influence in different regions of the world—Latin America, Asia and the Pacific, the Middle East, and Europe. More often than not US infiltration of this or other region followed one and the same pattern. A pretext was invented for armed interference, the use or threat of force, and fettering treaties were imposed on independent states. Puppet governments were brought to power and they received instructions from American advisers. Some territories were simply colonized.

Resemblance is striking in one more aspect: everywhere the US was trying to immediately consolidate and perpetuate its presence, building military bases and strongpoints on dependent territories, sending military advisers there, and trying to tie up as many states as possible to the US economic structure, and impose US arms supplies on them. History shows that such practice has remained essentially unchanged up to this day. It has only undergone minor modifications, while its methods have become more disguised and sophisticated.

II. US MILITARY BASES AND "LOW- INTENSITY" CONFLICTS

Armed force and violence have been the ultimate argument throughout the history of imperialism. A case in point is the history of US imperialism. Over the 200 years of its existence the US launched more than 200 wars and colonial expeditions. Pharisaically posing as an advocate of freedom and democracy, the US imperialism has been trying to impose its own rules on other nations and suppress their struggle for national and social liberation and progress.

The latest US doctrine of neoglobalism underlies its aggressive power politics. The essence of the doctrine is total disregard for the generally recognised norms of international relations, encroachment on the sovereignty of others, and continued attempts to rob nations of the right to a free choice. The doctrine of neoglobalism provides for the use of armed force up to direct military interference in different parts of the world, proclaimed the "zones of the US vital interests," more active use of subversion against legitimate governments which do not suit Washington, and assistance, including military, to reactionary regimes and counter-revolutionary groups.

In the post-war period since 1945, the US was either an initiator of or a party to most of the armed conflicts which claimed some ten million lives. Thus from 1946 to 1982, as Admiral James Watkins, US Chief of Naval

Operations, testified, the United States used its armed forces in about 250 instances. According to American sources, Washington contemplated the employment of nuclear weapons on 19 occasions, threatening the USSR directly on four and the developing nations on the rest of them. Bad memories of the infamous actions of American troops, aircraft and warships exist almost everywhere in the world—in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America.

Here are some examples:

In 1954, CIA-trained rebel forces with American air support invaded Guatemala to topple the democratically elected Arbenz government.

In 1958, a total of 14,000 US Marines and ground troops, backed by the Sixth Fleet, landed in Lebanon to help the reactionary government suppress mass popular action.

In 1961, there was an abortive intervention in Cuba to overthrow its revolutionary government.

In 1965-1972, the US conducted wanton aggression against the peoples of Indochina. Its consequences are still felt. The aggression involved almost 600,000 US troops with air and naval support.

In 1965, US Marines and paratroopers invaded the Dominican Republic to suppress a popular uprising and bring there a counter-revolutionary junta to power.

In 1973, there was a fascist coup in Chile, following a military rebellion engineered with CIA participation.

In 1982-1983, there was an act of direct intervention in the affairs of Lebanon under the umbrella of a "multinational peace-keeping force." Punitive operations against the national patriotic forces, and the shelling and bombing of population centres in the highland Lebanon caused numerous civilian casualties.

In 1983, there was an unprovoked act of international violence and state-sponsored terrorism—the armed



Alexander Portnyagin, 40, specialises in the affairs of the developing countries. He has authored a number of books and monographs. They include *US Strategy in the Indian Ocean Area* and *US Policy in Asia*. Besides, he has been writing for various popular and scholarly journals in the Soviet Union and abroad. He has participated in different international seminars and symposia.

- o **CMEA AND ASIA**
by N. Kudryashov and A. Polikanov
- o **A N-FREE NON-VIOLENT WORLD**
by Alexander Gorev
- o **SOVIET PEACE STRATEGY AND ASIA**
by Y. Rummyantsev
- o **SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVE: ASIAN ASPECT**
- o **DELHI DECLARATION AND ASIAN FUTURE**
by Yuri Vinogradov
- o **ASIA-PACIFIC: A YEAR AFTER VLADIVOSTOK**
- o **FROM PEACE DECREE TO PROGRAMME OF
N-WEAPONS ELIMINATION**
by Sergei Kuznetsov
- o **STAR WARS LEAD TO INSANE ARMS RACE**
by Vladimir Chernyshev
- o **TNCs: STRIKE FORCE OF NEO-GLOBALISM**
by Vladimir Andrianov
- o **NAM & STRUGGLE FOR PEACE & DISARMAMENT**
- o **ASIA-PACIFIC: PROMOTING PEACE AND
MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING**
- o **USSR & ANTI-COLONIAL STRUGGLE IN EAST**
by Tatiana Musatova
- o **STRUGGLE FOR ASIAN UNITY & SECURITY**
by Grigory Bondarevsky